



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>



228

f

2

12





VOL. XXV.

THE CABINET
HISTORY OF ENGLAND,
CIVIL, MILITARY,
AND
ECCLESIASTICAL;

FROM THE INVASION BY JULIUS CÆSAR TO THE YEAR 1846.

By CHARLES MACFARLANE.

VOL. THIRTEENTH.

XXV.—XXVI.



BLACKIE AND SON:
LONDON, EDINBURGH, AND GLASGOW.

—
M DCCCLV.



GLASGOW:
W. G. BLACKIE AND CO., PRINTERS,
VILLAYFIELD.

CABINET HISTORY OF ENGLAND.

BOOK XI.—*Continued.**

CHAPTER I.—*Continued.*

GEORGE III.—*Continued.*

A.D. 1815.—THE return of Bonaparte from Elba necessitated the departure of the Duke of Wellington and some other diplomatists from Vienna, but it did not for a moment interrupt the proceedings of the grand Congress assembled in that capital for the pacification and partial re-modelling of Europe. On the 9th of June, 1815, while the armies were gathering in Belgium and on the north-west frontier of France, and just nine days before the battle of Waterloo, a general treaty was signed in Congress at Vienna. Whatever may be wrong in the details, or even in the spirit of this greatest of all diplomatic acts, it is indisputable that Europe has owed to it a peace of more than thirty years' duration ; a peace attended by a wonderful progress and development. The negotiations, debates, and conferences, which preceded the conclusion of the treaty, were on many points most difficult and embarrassing, and were in some instances so violent as to threaten a renewal of war. France, under the government of Louis XVIII., was admitted a party into the Congress ; and she faintly joined England in the

* The abridgement of the 'Pictorial History of England' was concluded with the last volume (vol. xxiv.). The matter contained in this and the following volume (vols. xxv. and xxvi.) is new, and has been written expressly for the '*Cabinet History.*'

expression of a wish that the dismembered kingdom of Poland should be re-united, and that the Polish nationality should be restored. The high minded, the generous-hearted, and much-calumniated Lord Castlereagh was steady and earnest upon this subject; he recommended the reconstruction of the Polish nation, not only as matter of right and justice, but also as wise policy; and he predicted that the continuance of the old system would keep constantly alive a spirit of revolt and revolution: but his lordship found no real support in any one quarter, and the three great powers, Russia, Austria, and Prussia—but most of all Russia—were resolutely determined to keep and to enlarge such portions of Poland as they had possessed or claimed before the victories and conquests of Napoleon. There was, too, a very general conviction entertained throughout Europe that the reconstruction of Poland was a political impossibility—that there remained not in that unhappy country the materials wherewith to form a nation and a government. Russia, by absorbing the Grand Duchy of Warsaw, retained by far the greatest part of the country. Prussia and Austria could not agree as to the possession of Cracow; and therefore that city, with its very limited territory, was erected into an independent state, its independence being recognised and guaranteed by all the powers that were parties to the great treaty of Vienna. This was a sad error, sure to be followed by disastrous consequences. Surrounded on all sides by the three great partitioning powers, who could not but entertain a perpetual fear or jealousy of anything that bore the name or recalled the remembrance of Polish independence, Cracow, from the first, was doomed to an uneasy and precarious state of existence: she was watched, barred in, and dictated to, now by Russia, now by Austria, now by Prussia, and now by all three together. When the French, by the Revolution of July, 1830, gave encouragement and impetus to the revolutionary spirit throughout Europe, and when the Poles began their ill-prepared rash movement at *Warsaw*, Cracow was crowded with Polish emissaries and political propagandists: when that war of independ-

ence was ended by the Muscovite bayonet, Cracow gave refuge to many thousands of the proscribed fugitives, and within the walls of the city these desperate men formed new and most desperate plots and projects. From that moment the three great powers adopted the principle that the existence of Cracow as an independent state was incompatible with the existence of their own tranquillity; and, having the power, and not having due regard to the solemn decisions of Congress and the clauses of the Treaty of Vienna, they have now annexed Cracow to the dominions of the Emperor of Austria. All this might have been foreseen while the Congress was sitting and when the clauses were written. There ought to have been a larger Polish independence, or none at all.

The King of Saxony had been rewarded for his long subservience to the conquering Emperor of the French by vast annexations of territory in Poland and elsewhere: of these he was now stripped by the Congress of Vienna, and some portions of his own dominions were alienated from him, Prussia taking to herself a valuable part of Saxony.

Austria gave up her hereditary rights to the old provinces of the Low Countries, which are now classed under the general head of Belgium; and these provinces, being united to Holland, were raised up into the kingdom of the Netherlands, under the House of Orange. Thus was constituted a compact kingdom of 5,000,000 of inhabitants—an agricultural, a manufacturing, and a commercial kingdom, with rich and noble colonies in the East Indies and in the West—colonies which had formerly belonged to the Dutch, and which had been restored by the English, who had conquered them one and all during the late war. For such of those old colonies as England retained, a high price was paid. The interests of the Belgians and the Dutch coincided; the physical arrangement of this new state was altogether admirable. “But the moral overcame the material. The people would not amalgamate.”* Differing in traditions,

* *History of England during the Thirty Years' Peace*, by Charles Knight.

habits, dispositions, prejudices, and religion, the Dutch and the Belgians never could agree; and the tocsin sounded at Paris in July, 1830, was the signal for insurrection and final disseverance.

The Rhenish Provinces, with a fertile territory and an industrious people, were bestowed upon Prussia, which has not yet had the happy art of conciliating the affection of the population. On the whole, the Congress of Vienna raised Prussia from the degraded state into which she had fallen after the battle of Jena, to take rank among the greatest of European powers.

The Germanic Confederation was remodelled: the conflicting interests of a host of petty princes were harmonized into some semblance of Germanic nationality by the Congress of Vienna. Each state, however small, was to be independent; and, by a General Confederation, a formidable barrier was to be raised against any future conquest or invasion.

To reward Bernadotte for his exertions in the common cause, Norway was annexed to Sweden, this being strictly in accordance with the Convention of Kiel, which was concluded between Denmark and Sweden in 1814, while the general war was yet raging.

Austria obtained as great a prize as Prussia or as Russia: the Lombardo-Veneto kingdom became her's, with from 4,000,000 to 5,000,000 inhabitants. She thus made herself mistress of Venice and of the Adriatic Sea.

Savoy and Piedmont were restored to Sardinia; and by the act of Congress that ancient royal house was aggrandised and strengthened by the annexation of the old and effete Republic of Genoa. This arrangement, though severely criticised at the time by the party who claimed the sole right of being called Liberals, has acted most admirably, and has been quite as beneficial to the Genoese as to the Sardes or Piedmontese. To have resuscitated the old corrupt and tyrannical republic or oligarchy of Genoa, would have been to restore one of the worst governments that ever existed.

The terms granted to the French, who had so long been aggressors in every country of Europe, were ex-

ceedingly moderate: the limits fixed for France in 1815 were almost identical with the limits she had in 1790, or immediately before the commencement of her revolutionary wars. She was bound to pay, by gradual instalments, only seven hundred millions of francs, and she was to support, at her own expense, for a term of years, the army of occupation under the command of the Duke of Wellington.

The last three years of war alone had cost the British nation one hundred and ninety-seven millions—not millions of francs, but millions of pounds sterling. Our national debt testifies to the amount of our exertions and sacrifices. For the glory of overthrowing Bonaparte we are still paying dearly; but without that overthrow in what state might we not now be? At the Congress of Vienna England neither obtained nor demanded any commercial treaties, any exclusive privileges, or any petty advantages whatsoever; but she raised her voice for the abolition of the African slave-trade, and she wrung from France an immediate abolition of that traffic, and from all the high contracting powers a declaration that they would concert, without loss of time, “the most effectual measures for the entire and definitive abolition of a commerce so odious.”

The imperial parliament continued prorogued from the 11th of July, 1815, to the 1st of February, 1816. The incidents which occurred at home during that interval were few and unimportant.

A.D. 1816.—Parliament was opened by commission on the 5th of February, the Prince Regent not having yet recovered from a recent and alarming indisposition. Lord Castlereagh, who had put a new life into the war, and who had conducted the negotiations at Vienna when the war was over, was received with acclamations and shouts. But the harsh voice of opposition was not long silent. A cry was raised, and was long maintained by a small minority, that the minister had been fascinated by the absolute sovereigns and by the ministers of absolute sovereigns *with whom he had been so long associating in the Austrian capital*, and that he had sacrificed the

commercial interests of his own country and the independence and freedom of other nations. Complaints were also raised against the large military establishments that it was still necessary to keep up. In the House of Commons Mr. Brand (afterwards Lord Dacre) moved, by way of amendment, an addition to the address, pledging the government to a reduction of the taxes, and the House to an inquiry into the state of the nation. Lord John Russell, who had entered parliament in 1814, seconded this amendment, declaring the country to be suffering under unexampled domestic embarrassments, and demanding a careful revisal of our civil and military establishments, according to the principles of the most rigid economy. In reply ministers urged that the time was not yet come for greatly reducing our military establishments; that commerce was flourishing, and that the condition of the three united kingdoms was one of high prosperity, the chancellor of the exchequer, Mr. Vansittart (now the venerable Lord Bexley), intimating his intention of continuing the property or income tax on a modified scale of five per cent. This provoked a great storm, and about six weeks were almost entirely spent by the House of Commons in receiving petitions against the tax. At length, on the 17th of March, the tax was defeated by a majority of thirty-seven voices. After this decision the chancellor of the exchequer voluntarily abandoned the war duties upon malt, which amounted to about 2,700,000*l.* per annum. A bill was passed empowering the Bank of England to advance the sum of 6,000,000*l.* towards the supplies of the year; and another bill was carried for renewing the restriction of the Bank from making payments in specie until July 5th, 1818.

The league called the "Holy Alliance" had been signed at Paris by the Emperors of Russia and Austria and the King of Prussia on the 26th of September, 1815; and it had been promulgated by his Russian Imperial Majesty from St. Petersburg on the Christmas-day of that year. *The liberal party at once assumed that this league (the chief author of which was the half-mystical Emperor*

Alexander) had been framed in a very unholy spirit, and had for its primary object the subversion of all free and constitutional forms of government, and the establishment of a universal despotism on the continent of Europe. The extraordinary compact was thus worded :—

“ In the name of the Most Holy and Indivisible Trinity. Their Majesties the Emperor of Austria, the King of Prussia, and the Emperor of Russia having, in consequence of the great events which have marked the course of the three last years in Europe, and especially of the blessings which it has pleased Divine Providence to shower down upon those states which place their confidence and their hope on it alone, solemnly declare that the present act has no other object than to publish in the face of the whole world their fixed resolution, both in the administration of their respective states, and in their political relations with every other government, to take for their sole guide the precepts of that holy religion,—namely, the precepts of justice, Christian charity, and peace, which, far from being applicable only to private concerns, must have an immediate influence on the councils of princes, and guide all their steps, as being the only means of consolidating human institutions, and remedying their imperfections. In consequence, their Majesties have agreed on the following articles :—

“ Art. I.—Conformably to the words of the Holy Scriptures, which command all men to consider each other as brethren, the three contracting monarchs will remain united by the bonds of a true and indissoluble fraternity ; and, considering each other as fellow-countrymen, they will, on all occasions and in all places, lend each other aid and assistance ; and, regarding themselves towards their subjects and armies as fathers of families, they will lead them, in the same spirit of fraternity with which they are animated, to protect religion, peace, and justice.

“ 2.—In consequence, the sole principle in force, whether between the said governments or between their subjects, shall be that of doing each other reciprocal service, and of testifying, by unalterable good-will, the

mutual affection with which they ought to be animated, to consider themselves as members of one and the same Christian nation, the three allied princes looking on themselves as merely delegated by Providence to govern three branches of one family, namely, Austria, Prussia, and Russia; thus confessing that the Christian nation, of which they and their people form a part, has in reality no other Sovereign than Him to whom alone power really belongs, because in Him alone are found all treasures of love, science, and infinite wisdom; that is to say, God our Divine Saviour, the Word of the Most High, the Word of Life. Their Majesties consequently recommend to their people, with the most tender solicitude, as the sole means of enjoying that peace which arises from a good conscience, and which alone is durable, to strengthen themselves every day more and more in the principles and exercise of the duties which the Divine Saviour has taught mankind.

“ 3.—All the powers who shall choose solemnly to avow the sacred principles which have dictated the present act, and shall acknowledge how important it is for the happiness of nations that those truths should henceforth exercise over the destinies of mankind all the influence which belongs to them, will be received with equal ardour and affection into this holy alliance.

“ Done in triplicate, and signed at Paris, the year of grace 1815, Sept. 14 (26).

“ FRANCIS.

“ FREDERICK WILLIAM.

“ ALEXANDER.”

In the preceding year the Duke of Cumberland (at present King of Hanover) had married, at Berlin, a daughter of the reigning Duke of Mecklenburg-Strelitz, niece of the Queen of England, and widow of the Prince of Salms. It had long been the fate of the Duke of Cumberland to be excessively unpopular. A request made by his brother the Prince Regent for an accession of 6000*l.* a-year to the duke's income on his marriage encountered violent opposition, and the grant was

finally thrown out by a majority of *one*. Very different feelings were shown at another royal marriage. On the 3rd of May of the present year (1816), the Regent's daughter and only child, the Princess Charlotte of Wales, united herself to Prince Leopold of Saxe-Cobourg, the third son of one of the smaller German princes, and at that time a cavalry officer in the Austrian service, with scarcely any other income than such as was derivable from his profession. On the part of the princess this was entirely a match of inclination. It was a marriage of her own choice; and all allowed that she had chosen well; for, Prince Leopold, to the advantages of a fine and striking person, added the reputation of being very accomplished and very amiable. The princess had always been the darling of the people. Previously to the nuptials parliament voted 60,000*l.* a-year for their establishment; and, in the event of the decease of the princess, 50,000*l.* per annum was settled on the prince during his life. Universally the marriage of the Princess Charlotte was hailed as a public blessing; and it dissipated, for a time, the clouds of unpopularity which had gradually been gathering round the Regent her father.

Notwithstanding the contrary affirmation of ministers, there was considerable distress in many parts of the community, and a temporary paralysis of industry. Sailors discharged from the fleets, disbanded militia-men, and old soldiers of the line not sufficiently provided for by the government and country they had so nobly served, swelled the ranks of the unemployed and indigent. In consequence of an inclement season and a very bad harvest in 1815, the price of grain, consequently of meat, rose in 1816 to a fearful amount. In various parts of England there followed what Lord Bacon calls "rebellions of the belly;" and these movements were not checked without bloodshed. Moreover, in some of the manufacturing districts, the operatives made war upon machinery, as upon an enemy that deprived them of employment. And at this turbulent season the men who called *themselves* "Radical Reformers," stepped *actively forward to give new elements to the storm.*

William Cobbett addressed the "Journeymen and Labourers" of England, Scotland, and Ireland, in a very cheap and exciting periodical paper; and numerous demagogues, with far less ability but with an energy and activity quite equal to Cobbett's, spread themselves over town and country, seeking for poverty and disaffection. Innumerable political clubs were again organized, and great public meetings were called, which could not be held without some riot or disorder. The worst of these riots occurred on the 2nd of December, in an open space (now covered with streets and squares) called Spasfields, on the north-east skirts of London. While orator Hunt was haranguing the mob from one waggon, orator Watson, junior, jumped down from another waggon, and with a Jacobin or tricoloured flag in his hand, and with a ragged mob at his heels, rushed away through the streets to storm and take the Tower of London. A halt was called on Snowhill at the shop of Mr Beckwith, a gunsmith. Young Watson rushed in demanding arms, and presently shot a gentleman who happened to be in the shop, and who remonstrated with him. The shop was soon plundered and destroyed; and the mob proceeded along Cheapside, firing their recently acquired arms, "like children with a new plaything." At the Royal Exchange they were met by the Lord Mayor and Sir James Shaw, who behaved with admirable firmness, and who, being aided only by a few constables, secured several of the rioters. With diminished numbers—for many now took to their heels—the Watsonians or Spasfieldian philanthropists proceeded to the Minories, where they plundered some more gunsmiths' shops; and from the Minories they marched to the Tower, which was summoned in form by some vagabond who had a sonorous voice. We need scarcely say that the gates of the fortress did not fly open upon such a summons. Fearing that the troops might be upon them, the mob presently fled in all directions; and so ended this incoherent and *lame* insurrection. Not a drop of blood was shed

* Charles Knight, 'History of the Thirty Years' Peace.'

except that of the gentleman in Mr. Beckwith's shop ; and he eventually recovered. An unlucky and destitute Irish sailor named Cashman was convicted of the offence of plunder in the shop on Snowhill, and was hanged. Watson junior escaped from his pursuers, and, flying to the United States, became an American citizen. In the summer of 1817, Watson the elder was tried for high treason and acquitted.

But the year 1816 presents a manlier exercise of arms, and a nobler subject for contemplation. The piracies, man-stealing, butchery and plunder which the Barbary states on the Mediterranean had been allowed to practise, had been for long ages a standing reproach to Christendom. The dread of the naval power of England had for a long time secured British ships and subjects from the attacks of these barbarians ; and if, now and then, an English sailor was captured and sold into slavery, it was while serving under some foreign flag. There were not wanting among us men of narrow hearts and narrower heads, who would fain have left these Barbary corsairs in their undisturbed *in statu quo*, considering the immunity of the British flag as a great commercial advantage over the other European nations ; but such thoughts found no place in the great and liberal mind of the nation ; and England was the first to make a costly exertion for the abatement of a monstrous nuisance from which she herself was suffering nothing, and had nothing to fear. It has been well said that "the enterprise was still more distinguished for the generosity of its motives, than even for its brilliant success."* Early in the spring of this year, Admiral Lord Exmouth, commanding in the Mediterranean, received orders to demand from the Beys of Tripoli and Tunis, and the Dey of Algiers, satisfaction and protection for the flags of the Ionian Isles, "which the Congress of Vienna had left under our protection," and the flags of Naples and Sardinia, together with the total abandonment of Christian slavery. Tripoli and Tunis taking

* Wallace, 'History of the Life and Reign of George IV.:

counsel of their weakness, implicitly complied; but Algiers, relying on her great strength, offered only a partial satisfaction for the past, and refused or temporized for the rest.

Before taking any steps in fulfilment of his instructions, Lord Exmouth made all the arrangements necessary for an attack, which was to be the alternative if negotiations failed; a result much to be expected at Algiers, which had hitherto withstood so many formidable armaments. His lordship ordered Captain Warde of the *Banterer* to proceed to Algiers, and then carefully to observe the town, and the nature of its defences, to draw a plan of the works on the seaward side, to take soundings, to make his observations on the anchorage, &c. "Lord Exmouth's instructions on this occasion, and which were written with his own hand, afforded an admirable illustration of the forethought with which he provided for every contingency, and which was the chief secret of his constant success."* Captain Warde performed his difficult and important service with wonderful skill, secrecy, and judgment. On first intimating, by a General Order to his squadron, the service upon which they were proceeding, the Commander-in-chief employed these plain yet spirit-stirring words:—

"The Commander-in-chief embraces the earliest moment in which he could inform the fleet of his destination, without inconvenience to the public service.

"He has been instructed by his Royal Highness the Prince Regent to proceed with the fleet to Algiers, and there make certain arrangements for diminishing at least the piratical excursions of the Barbary States, by which thousands of our fellow-creatures, innocently following their commercial pursuits, have been dragged into the most wretched and revolting state of slavery.

"The Commander-in-chief is confident that this outrageous system of piracy and slavery rouses in common the same spirit of indignation which he himself feels;

* *Edward Osler, Esq., 'Life of Admiral Viscount Exmouth.'*

and should the government of Algiers refuse the reasonable demand he bears from the Prince Regent, he doubts not but the flag will be honourably and zealously supported by every officer and man under his command, in his endeavours to procure the acceptance of them by force ; and if force must be resorted to, we have the consolation of knowing that we fight in the sacred cause of humanity, and cannot fail of success."

The Admiralty were greatly surprised when Lord Exmouth proposed to attack Algiers with only five sail of the line. Many naval officers, upon being consulted by the board, considered those works as altogether unassailable by ships. His lordship was offered any force he required, but he firmly adhered to his first demand ; for he had satisfied himself that five ships could destroy the great fortifications on the mole as effectually as a greater number, and with far more safety to themselves. After he had explained his plans, and marked the position which every ship was to occupy, the Admiralty allowed him to act upon his own judgment. "All will go well," said this brave, great sailor, and most excellent man. "All will go well, as far at least as it depends on me. I know that nothing can resist a line-of-battle ship's fire." On the 9th of August the veteran was at Gibraltar. Here he found a Dutch squadron of five frigates and a corvette, commanded by Vice-Admiral the Baron de Capellan, who, on learning the object of the expedition, solicited and obtained leave to co-operate. On Tuesday the 27th of August they came in sight of Algiers. As the ships lay nearly becalmed, Lord Exmouth sent Lieutenant Burgess in a boat, under a flag of truce, with the terms dictated by the Prince Regent, and a demand for the immediate liberation of the British consul and some other persons whom the Dey had cast into prison. At eleven o'clock A.M. Lieutenant Burgess was met outside the mole by the captain of the port, who received the communication, and promised an answer in two hours. In the meantime a breeze springing up, the fleet stood into the bay, and lay to, about a mile from the town. At *two o'clock* Lieutenant Burgess and the boat were seen

returning with the signal that no answer had been given. The admiral's ship, the 'Queen Charlotte,' instantly telegraphed to the fleet, "Are you ready?" And instantly the affirmative signal was displayed from every ship, and they all, English and Dutch, frigates and ships of the line, bore up to their appointed stations. The 'Queen Charlotte' led to the attack. There was to be no firing from her until she came to anchor. The Algerines, confident in the strength of their works, also reserved their fire; indeed they expected to carry the flag-ship by boarding her from their numerous gun-boats. The 'Queen Charlotte' proceeded silently to her position; and, at half-past two she anchored, by the stern, just half a cable's length from the terrible mole-head. "The mole was crowded with troops, many of whom got upon the parapet to look at the ship; and Lord Exmouth, observing them as he stood upon the poop, waved to them to move away. As soon as the ship was fairly placed, and her cables stoppered, the crew gave three hearty cheers, such as Englishmen only can give. Scarcely had the sound of the last died away, when a gun was fired from the upper tier of the eastern battery; and a second, and a third followed in quick succession. One of the shots struck the 'Superb.' At the first flash, Lord Exmouth gave the order, 'Stand by!' at the second, 'Fire.' The report of the third gun was drowned in the thunder of the 'Queen Charlotte's' broadside.*

The Algerines replied with the fire of nearly five hundred guns. The mole was filled with cannon, like the side of a line-of-battle ship, mostly disposed in a double tier, with ports below and embrasures above; but the eastern batteries, next the lighthouse, had an inner fortification, with a third tier of guns, making 66 in these eastern batteries alone. These different batteries on the mole mounted altogether about 220 guns, 18 being 24 or 32 pounders, and 2 of them being 68-pounders, upwards of twenty feet long. All these guns were brought to bear point-blank upon Lord Exmouth's ships of the

* Osler, 'Life of Exmouth.'

line. Some of his lordship's frigates and some of the Dutch frigates took up positions which three-deckers might have been justly proud of. There were a few bomb-vessels, whose shells were thrown with admirable precision by our marine artillery. There was no lack of courage and resolution on the part of the corsairs. Shortly after the commencement of the battle their flotilla of gun-boats most daringly advanced to board the 'Queen Charlotte' and the 'Leander.' At first the smoke covered and concealed them, but so soon as they were seen a few well-directed shot sent thirty-three out of thirty-seven of these Algerine gun-boats to the bottom. At four o'clock a large Algerine frigate was boarded and set on fire. As she burst into a flame, Lord Exmouth telegraphed to the fleet the animating signal, "Infallible!" Before seven o'clock all the vessels in port, except a brig and a schooner, were burning fast to the water's edge. As for the tremendous works on the mole-head, they had been ruined by the single fire of the 'Queen Charlotte' a very few minutes after the combat had commenced. The fleet slackened their fire towards night, while the guns of the enemy became silent, and when the necessity was felt of husbanding our ammunition. The expenditure had been beyond all precedent. Our ships had fired nearly 118 tons of powder and 50,000 shot, weighing more than 500 tons of iron, besides 960 13 and 10 inch shells. Such a fire, close, concentrated, and well directed as it was, nothing could resist. The mighty sea-defences of Algiers, with great part of the town itself, were shattered and crumbled to ruins. As the night darkened the breeze freshened, and a tremendous storm of thunder and lightning came on with torrents of rain; while the flaming ships and store-houses illuminated all the ruins on shore, which increased the grandeur and awfulness of the scene. In scarcely any former general action had the casualties been so great in proportion to the force employed. In the British ships 128 were killed and 690 wounded; and the Dutch, *who had behaved most gallantly*, had 13 killed and 52 wounded. The veteran Commander-in-chief

escaped most narrowly : he was struck in three places, and a cannon-shot tore away the skirts of his coat, breaking one of the glasses and bulging the rim of the spectacles in his pocket.*

On the 28th, at daylight, Lieutenant Burgess was sent on shore with a flag of truce, and with the same demands he had carried the preceding morning ; our bomb-vessels at the same time resuming their positions. His lordship was immediately given to understand that all his demands would be submitted to. On the morning of the 29th Captain Brisbane, of the flag-ship, went on shore and had a conference with the humbled and astounded Dey. The negotiations were intrusted to Sir Charles Penrose. They were very short, for the Algerines could do nothing but submit and agree. On the following day, the 30th of August, this general memorandum was issued from on board the ‘ Queen Charlotte :’—

“ The Commander-in-chief is happy to inform the fleet of the final termination of their strenuous exertions by the signature of peace confirmed under a salute of twenty-one guns, on the following conditions, dictated by his Royal Highness the Prince Regent of England :—

“ I. The abolition of Christian slavery for ever.

“ II. The delivery to my flag of all slaves in the dominion of the Dey, to whatever nation they may belong, at noon to-morrow.

“ III. To deliver also to my flag all moneys received by him for the redemption of slaves since the commencement of this year at noon also to-morrow.

“ IV. Reparation has been made to the British consul for all losses he has sustained in consequence of his confinement.

“ V. The Dey has made a public apology in presence of his ministers and officers, and begged pardon of the consul in terms dictated by the captain of the ‘ Queen Charlotte.’ ”

Three thousand Christians were delivered from slavery

* Osler.

and sent to their own countries and homes. Leaving a ship to receive a few more, Lord Exmouth sailed for England on the 3rd of September. Scarcely Nelson himself had been in hotter fires than Exmouth, yet his lordship declared that he had never been under a fire so hot and terrible as this at Algiers. "The fire all round the mole," said he, "looked like Pandemonium. I never saw anything so grand and so *terrific*; for I was not on velvet, for fear they would drive on board us. Their copper-bottoms floated full of fiery hot charcoal, and were red-hot above the surface, so that we could not hook on our fire-grapnels to put the boats to, and could do nothing but push out fire-booms and spring the ship off by our warps, as occasion required. . . . I never saw any set of men more obstinate at their guns, and it was superior fire only that could keep them back. To be sure nothing could stand before the 'Queen Charlotte's' broadside. Everything fell before it; and the Swedish consul assures me we killed above five hundred at the very first fire, from the crowded way in which their troops were drawn up, four-deep, above the gun-boats, which were also full of men. . . . I believe they are within bounds when they state their loss at seven thousand men."*

In the East Indies victory attended our arms. The Gorkhas of Nepaul had long been turbulent neighbours to the Company, and a terrible scourge to many of the allies of the British. The Nepaulese frontier was about six hundred miles in length, and for the most part very rugged; and the enemy had the command of all the passes of the forest and jungles as well as of the hills. Little, very little, was known either of the interior of the country or of the character and habits of the people; but the strength of the country was great, being skirted and intersected by lofty mountains, and abounding in excellent defensive positions; and the people were hardy, robust, and warlike, and by no means destitute of military skill and ingenuity. The Gorkhas alone had twelve

* *Lord Exmouth, Letter to his Brother, as quoted by Osler.*

thousand fighting men, dressed, armed, and disciplined in imitation of the Company's sepoy. An attempt which was made upon their country in 1814 was almost a complete failure, and it cost the lives of General Gillespie and many brave officers and men; but a second campaign, which commenced in February, 1816, and which was left to the entire management of Major-General Auchterlony, was attended with a success as complete as could have been desired. After a stern contest, and several sanguinary battles, the enemy submitted to the conditions dictated by the brave and skilful Auchterlony. The Rajah of Nepaul bound himself never to disturb the Company's frontiers or the territories of any of its allies; never to advance any claim to the territories which had formerly been disputed, or which were now ceded to the Company; never to retain in his service any British subject, or the subject of any European or American state, without the consent of the British government; to allow the permanent residence of an English minister at the Court of Catmandoo, and to send accredited ministers of his own to reside at Calcutta. The territory ceded was of considerable extent and of great military importance. All the articles of the treaty were executed with rare punctuality.

The reverses and losses sustained in the first campaign in Nepaul encouraged the Pindarees to make some of their predatory and devastating incursions on the Company's territories. These Pindarees were not a distinctive race, but a numerous class of men of different races, religions, and habits, gradually associating and assimilating by a common pursuit: they were all horsemen and all robbers: they destroyed and left waste whatever province they visited. Their name first occurs in Indian history about the end of the seventeenth century. From that period they had been a scourge and a curse to a great part of Hindostan. They frequently acted in concert with the Mahrattas, who were well nigh as plunderous and as brutal as themselves. In October, 1815, eight thousand of these marauders crossed the *Nerbudda*, committing terrible devastations. In Febru-

ary, 1816, ten thousand of them crossed the same river and pressed southward, plundering and burning every town and village that lay on their way, and massacring the people or torturing them in order to extract confession of the places where they had hidden their money and valuables. Earl Moira, now Governor-General, made the most energetic efforts to put down these bandits; and Lieutenant-Colonel Walker, Major Lushington, and other able officers, had the merit of driving them out of the Company's territories with very great loss.

In the course of the years 1815 and 1816 the interior of the island of Ceylon, against which more than one very unsuccessful attempt had been made, was entirely conquered and occupied; the Candyans at last quietly submitted to our rule. Since the close of the year 1818, when the flames of insurrection were kindled for a short time, this rich and beautiful island, the outwork and bulwark of our empire in India, appears to have been tranquil, and, to the European settlers, prosperous; but the native Candyans have contracted the vices and none of the virtues of civilization, and their numbers are said to be rather on the decline than on the increase.

A.D. 1817.—At home the year opened rather gloomily, for provisions were still dear, employment was defective, and the popular ebullitions of 1816 had excited a scarcely warrantable amount of distrust and suspicion on the part of the government. Ministers indeed had most unwisely had recourse to an un-English system of espionage; and the spies, in order to show that they well earned their money, and that their pay ought to be continued, made plots where none existed, or exaggerated the discourses and intentions of a set of most obscure and impotent clubbists, or—which was by many degrees more infamous still—they feigned to put themselves at the head of these secret societies, and, having gained the confidence of some of these dupes, they suggested extreme, treasonable measures, and then denounced to government the fools they had betrayed and prompted. *Such will ever be the effect of employing spies. There was a necessity for caution, and also for a good effective*

police, which, as yet, had no existence ; but the measures adopted by ministers went to convert a small danger into a great one, and to demoralize and denationalize the people.

The Regent opened the session of Parliament in person on the 28th of January. He had been sorely assailed by a great portion of the newspaper press, and he had seen or fancied, on his way down to the House, that the vast crowds assembled had looked gloomily and angrily upon him. He read the speech with a faltering voice. It was now admitted that there was a deficiency in the revenue, and that an inquiry into the state of the public income and expenditure demanded the early and serious attention of the House of Commons. Considerable advantages to the trade and internal transactions of the country were however anticipated from the immediate issue of a new coinage. The speech concluded with the following reference to the uneasy state of the country :—“ The distresses consequent upon the termination of a war of such unusual extent and duration have been felt, with greater or less severity, throughout all the nations of Europe ; and have been considerably aggravated by the unfavourable state of the season.

“ Deeply as I lament the pressure of these evils upon the country, I am sensible that they are of a nature not to admit of an immediate remedy ; but whilst I observe with peculiar satisfaction the fortitude with which so many privations have been borne, and the active benevolence which has been employed to mitigate them, I am persuaded that the great sources of our national prosperity are essentially unimpaired ; and I entertain a confident expectation that the native energy of the country will, at no distant period, surmount all the difficulties in which we are involved.

“ In considering our internal situation, you will, I doubt not, feel a just indignation at the attempts which have been made to take advantage of the distresses of the country, for the purpose of exciting a spirit of *sedition and violence*.

“ *I am too well convinced of the loyalty and good*

sense of the great body of his majesty's subjects, to believe them capable of being perverted by the arts which are employed to seduce them; but I am determined to omit no precautions for preserving the public peace, and for counteracting the designs of the disaffected. And I rely with the utmost confidence on your cordial support and co-operation, in upholding a system of law and government from which we have derived inestimable advantages, which has enabled us to conclude, with unexampled glory, a contest whereon depended the best interests of mankind, and which has been hitherto felt by ourselves, as it is acknowledged by other nations, to be the most perfect that has ever fallen to the lot of any people."

Having read these words, his royal highness, still evidently much agitated, retired, and their lordships adjourned till five o'clock. When they re-assembled, Lord Sidmouth, secretary for the home department, rose, and with a face of great consternation announced that, before any other matter could be entered upon by their lordships, he had one of the most important communications to make to them that had ever been laid before parliament. In consequence of this announcement the house was cleared of all strangers, and all ears were given to the awe-stricken secretary. He told a simple story in a very solemn manner.

On his return from the House, the glass of the Regent's carriage was broken by a stone, which Lord Sidmouth and Lord James Murray tried to convert into a bullet, or into two bullets fired by some unseen air-gun. This led to some loud debates in parliament, and to a proclamation offering one thousand pounds to any loving subject that would discover and cause to be apprehended the authors, actors, and abettors concerned in such outrage. It appears equally certain that the missile was nothing but a stone or piece of gravel, and that the prince was surrounded and treated in a very unmannerly way by a mob composed of the lowest rabble of London. But far more importance was given to the matter than it *merited*. On the 24th of February, Lord Sidmouth in

the Upper House, and Lord Castlereagh in the Lower, announced their intention to submit the five following bills, as essentially necessary to check the spirit of turbulence and disaffection :—1. A bill to extend to the person of the Prince Regent the Act for the better protection of his majesty's person. 2. A bill to revive the Act of 1795 against seditious meetings. 3. A bill to revive the Act of 39 Geo. III. against corresponding societies. 4. A bill to revive the Act against such as seduce soldiers and sailors. 5. A bill to suspend the Habeas Corpus Act.

Such were the noted FIVE ACTS, which spread consternation through no small portion of the community. The 2nd and the 5th of these bills were strenuously resisted. Lord Wellesley opposed the suspension of the Habeas Corpus Act, which he considered as a virtual suspension of the whole British constitution, in an eloquent and powerful speech. Earl Grey, Lord Darnley, Mr. Bennet, Sir Arthur Pigott, and other members of either house, took the same course. Lord Grey asked what manner of men were the chief actors in the alleged conspiracies of which government pretended to entertain so great a dread? "Were they persons of consequence and connexion in the country? No. They were miserable wretches, reduced to the lowest poverty and distress. What was their object? To produce insurrection by calling persons together on the pretext of parliamentary reform, without any previous concert and design, and trusting wholly to chance for stimulating their instruments in the work of sedition. This was the whole extent of the plot; and one attempt had been made in Spafields in the way that was projected. Those formidable rioters fled at the very mention of a dragoon. They did not wait to see his horse's head at the top of a street. Admirable, indeed, had been the military arrangements of that able commander, General Lord Viscount Sidmouth." Lord Grey further insisted that there were acts of parliament, chiefly of modern date, *under which all these offences might be prosecuted and punished.* He said, however, that he would have con-

sented to a new law for preventing great popular meetings in the open air without a previous notice to a magistrate ; and would also have cheerfully agreed to a bill for the better security of the person of the Prince Regent. Sir Samuel Romilly and Sir James Mackintosh strove to set aside the horrible, traitor-death sentence, which occurred so frequently in some of the bills : for death they would have substituted transportation ; but all their amendments were lost upon division. The alarm was kept up by Lord Grenville, who declared that the present situation of the country appeared to him one of extreme danger ; that extraordinary legislative measures were absolutely necessary ; and that, such being the serious conviction of his mind, he was compelled to give his cordial though reluctant support for the temporary suspension of the Habeas Corpus Act. And the lord advocate of Scotland created fresh terrors by announcing that he had just discovered a secret conspiracy which had been organized in Glasgow, and which had communications with political societies in this country. This conspiracy, he said, was held together by means of a secret oath, which he would read to the House. The oath was truculent enough ; and it bound those who took it to demand and obtain, “ either by moral or *physical* strength, as the case might require, universal suffrage for the people of Great Britain and Ireland, and annual parliaments.” Before the end of March all the five bills were carried by large majorities. Some new riotous movements in the manufacturing districts—where, in truth, there were demagogues who would have worked mischief if they had but had the power—seemed, in the eyes of what was undoubtedly a majority of the nation, a more than sufficient justification of the severity of ministers. Yet these poor rioters never arrived at the execution of any serious mischief : they fled at the sight of a red coat, whether it was worn by a soldier or by a yeoman. Many of them were seized and thrown into prison, to the notable increase of that poverty and distress which had first caused them to *listen to the incendiaries*.

On the 13th of March, Mr. Brougham had proposed

very different remedies for the existing distress. He argued that a revival of loyalty and tranquillity would go hand in hand with a revival of trade; that commerce must be more unshackled than it had hitherto been; that it had become absolutely necessary to enter upon a careful but fearless revision of our whole commercial system, in order that we might be enabled safely, yet promptly, to eradicate those vices which the lapse of time had occasioned. He attacked the Navigation Law as one of the great causes of declining trade. "Whatever," said he, "may originally have been the good policy of the Navigation Law, I am quite clear that we have adhered to its strict enactments essentially after the circumstances which alone justified its adoption had ceased to exist." The speech was remarkable for its eloquence and force, and it still is remarkable as being a grand prelude to the extensive alterations which have been made in our commercial and navigation systems between the years 1827 and 1847. Anticipating by some years his great rival, Mr. Canning, Mr. Brougham called attention to the infant republics of South America, which were then struggling for their independence, and which seemed to promise a new field for our enterprise, and an illimitable market for our manufacturers. Like Mr. Canning, at the later period, he took too sanguine a view of those distracted countries, and entertained a too confident hope of the political wisdom and moderation of the Spanish South Americans. In the way of rational government, those people had settled nothing in 1817; and their perennial pronunciamientos, insurrections, and revolutions seem to prove that they have settled very little in 1847. The foreign trade of the country has indeed been rendered more free and open; but it may be reasonably doubted whether in every other respect South America has not deteriorated since it shook off the yoke of Spain, and parted with its monarchic institutions to try desperate experiments in democratic republicanism.

As early as the year 1794 conspiracies, of which little *is known*, had broken out both in Mexico and in New Granada. In 1797 another and a formidable conspiracy

against the oppressive Spanish government was organized in Venezuela; but it ended in the flight, execution, or imprisonment of the principal conspirators. About the same time General Miranda, a Peruvian by birth, who had served in the armies of the French republic, leagued himself with a revolutionary party, and began to concert measures for overthrowing the dominion of Spain in every part of South America. Miranda had frequent conferences and a long correspondence with Mr. Pitt; and schemes were discussed (which all came to nothing) for forming an alliance between the revolted provinces and Great Britain and the United States. In 1806 Miranda, with only 500 volunteers, made a very fruitless attempt on the Caracas. Shortly after this our British expeditions to South America—although productive of little else to us than loss and disgrace, and the shameful capitulation of General Whitelocke—somewhat shook the tottering power of the Spanish viceroys, and familiarised the minds of the people to warfare and struggles. But the dis-severance of the colonies from the mother country was mainly precipitated by the French invasion of Spain. The people would not recognise the intrusive King Joseph Bonaparte, and Joseph had no possible means of coercing them. The Bourbon Ferdinand, a state-prisoner in France, was still more powerless than the brother of Napoleon; but his Spanish generals and his native Spanish troops, pretty generally, stood manfully up for his rights when they found that the colonists intended to obey neither King Ferdinand nor King Joseph, but were aiming at an entire independence, like that of the United States of North America. In 1810, when Spain seemed to be absolutely conquered by the French, and when the weak, miserable Spanish Cortes, cooped up in Cadiz, revoked a previous decree which gave something like liberty of commerce to the colonies, the standard of revolt was first actually raised by the famous Miguel Hidalgo y Costilla, *cura*, or parish priest, of the little town of Dolores, in the province of Guanapiato. At first this parish priest was very successful. He took the capital of the province, *being assisted by the native population of the place, who*

showed how well they were prepared for liberty and democracy, by committing atrocious butcheries and spoliations. Advancing to Valladolid as a conqueror, at the head of 50,000 men, he was joined in that city, from which the Spaniards had fled, by his old college friend, José Maria Morelos, cura of Mucupetaro, who was destined to play a very important part in these sanguinary and never-ending revolutions. But at the end of the year fortune began to turn against Miguel Hidalgo. He was defeated with immense slaughter by the troops of the viceroy of Mexico. On the 16th of January, 1811, he was routed again, and being betrayed by a former friend, he was seized on his flight, and was shortly afterwards tried and shot, together with three of his officers.

The Spaniards, in the ordinary way, considered the insurgents as rebels and traitors; and they treated them as such whenever victory or fortune gave them the power. But on either side, and from the very beginning of these long wars to the very end of them, atrocious cruelties were committed; butcheries in every town that was surprised or otherwise taken; massacres of prisoners in cold blood; tortures as well as death; no respect for age or for sex.

The insurrection was already too deeply impressed and rooted in the hearts of the South Americans to be very seriously affected by the loss of any one chief, or by any temporary discomfiture. The place of Miguel Hidalgo was supplied partly by Morelos, partly by Ignacio Lopez Rayon. A junto, or central government, composed of only five members, was installed on the 10th of September, 1811, in the town of Zitacuaro, in the State of Valladolid. Morelos, who had much military science as well as activity, gained several victories over the Spaniards, and by the beginning of 1812 he brought the scene of action within a few leagues of the capital. In the month of November, 1813, was issued, for the first time, what the junto pleased to call the Declaration of the Independence of Mexico. But from this point the fortunes of Morelos and of the insurrection began to decline. He *was beaten again and again* by Augustin Iturbide (after-

wards Emperor of Mexico), then a colonel in the Spanish service. In November, 1815, Morelos was taken prisoner, and he was shot at Mexico in the following December. By the beginning of the year 1817, the numbers of the insurgents actually in arms, on the Mexican territories, had become to all appearance very inconsiderable; and the royalist forces were in possession of all the towns and of nearly all the military stations. But the cause of independence, though liable to many checks, had been making, and was still making, progress in the province of Quito in New Grenada, and in other parts of those vast regions; and Simon Bolivar had taken the field as Captain-general of the insurgents.

At the time when Mr. Brougham delivered his remarkable speech in Parliament, it was at the least doubtful to most men in Europe which of the two contending parties in South America would prove victorious. Few men could anticipate that the struggle would prove of such a long duration, and would leave such a wretched, unsettled, anarchic state of things behind it. It was scarcely possible for the orator to exceed the truth in speaking of the fertility and wonderful natural resources of the country—"that mighty expanse of territory, variegated with every species of soil, exposed to all the gradations of climate, rich from the fallow of centuries, sufficiently peopled to raise every variety of the produce we want, yet too thinly inhabited to threaten our own industry with any rivalry, watered in all directions by seas rather than rivers, studded with harbours through which to distribute its wealth over the whole world." From this time volunteers began to flock from England to the insurgent states in South America.

A committee of finance was appointed. Lord Castle-reagh proposed to make reductions on expenditure to the amount of two millions and a half. But the sum of 500,000*l.* in exchequer bills, for public works and fisheries in Great Britain, and 250,000*l.* out of the consolidated fund, for the same purpose to Ireland, were voted *in April, as means of alleviating the existing distress.*

On the 30th of May Mr. Abbot, Speaker of the House of Commons, resigned, and was succeeded by Mr. Manners Sutton.

The country seemed now tranquil; but in the course of the summer fresh disturbances broke out in some of the midland and northern counties. These were very easily suppressed. At the York assizes several persons were charged with high treason, but they were all acquitted and liberated, with the exception of two, who were detained in prison under the suspension of the Habeas Corpus Act. At Derby three men, tried by a special commission, were capitally convicted and executed. Several others were permitted to plead guilty, and had their lives spared.

On the 6th of November the Princess Charlotte of Wales, then in the twenty-second year of her age, died at Claremont, a few hours after having given birth to a still-born child. The grief for this most unexpected event was deep, universal, and sincere. The three nations mourned for her; and in whatever part of the world there were a few Englishmen, there was sadness and gloom when the news arrived.

A.D. 1818.—On the 27th of January parliament was opened by commission. The addresses upon the speech (which referred to the calamitous and untimely death of the Regent's beloved and only child) were passed in both houses without any opposition. As soon as the address had passed the Lords, Viscount Sidmouth gave notice that he meant, on the following day, to move a bill for the repeal of the Habeas Corpus Suspension Act. This repeal was voted most rapidly. A bill of indemnity was considered necessary by ministers, and this was passed in the House of Lords on the 5th of March by 100 against 33. A protest was entered on the journals signed by 10 peers. In the House of Commons this indemnity bill was carried by very large majorities.

On the motion of the chancellor of the exchequer, *government* was enabled to direct exchequer-bills, to an *amount not exceeding one million*, towards building, and *promoting the building of additional churches and chapels*

in England. From a debate which was commenced by Dr. Phillimore, it appeared that, by a treaty lately concluded, the sum of 400,000*l.* was to be paid by the British government to Spain as a compensation for the losses which that power might sustain by consenting to the abolition of the slave-trade; and it was further made to appear that the Spaniards and South Americans were prosecuting that traffic as actively as ever, and that there would be extreme difficulty in preventing their so doing.

Three royal marriages, upon the failure of a royal progeny, which resulted from the death of the Princess Charlotte, took place during the session of parliament. The Duke of Clarence married the Princess of Saxe Meiningen, eldest daughter of the late reigning Duke of Saxe Meiningen; the Duke of Kent married the sister of Prince Leopold, widower of the Princess Charlotte; and the Duke of Cambridge the Princess of Hesse, youngest daughter of the Landgrave Frederick, and niece of the Elector of Hesse. Upon messages from the Regent, increased allowances were voted for each of these married princes; and now the Duke of Cumberland obtained the increase of 6000*l.* a-year as well as his brothers.*

A bill was carried for varying and amending certain provisions of the Regency Act.

Early in the session a committee was formed in the House of Commons to consider of a bill proposed by Mr. Brougham, respecting the shamefully neglected education of the poor, and the abuses of the public charities which had been intended for a better education. On the 8th of May the order of the day for going into a committee on this bill being read, Mr. Brougham made a long and eloquent speech, and produced a series of startling facts and shameful abuses, which made a deep impression on the public mind. Our progress—thwarted by sectarian

* About the same time the Princess Elizabeth, third daughter of the King, espoused the Hereditary Prince of Hesse Homburg; but this marriage did not occasion any *application to parliament.*

and other prejudices—has been but slow ; yet from Mr. Brougham's great speech in 1818 may be dated the commencement of a great improvement in all that relates to national education and the instruction of the poor. Of this merit no one can ever deprive Henry Lord Brougham and Vaux. Before the present session ended Mr. Brougham succeeded in carrying the appointment of a commission to inquire into the state of education of the poor throughout England and Wales, and to inquire into the abuses of public charities for the education of the poor.

The Prince Regent closed the session in person. After alluding to the recent distress and turbulence, and to the long and terrible war out of which they had sprung, his royal highness said, " But deeply as I felt for the immediate pressure upon his majesty's people, I nevertheless looked forward without dismay, having always the fullest confidence in the solidity of the resources of the British empire, and in the relief which might be expected from a continuance of peace, and from the patience, public spirit, and energy of the nation. These expectations have not been disappointed."

So soon as the Regent had delivered the speech the Lord Chancellor declared the present parliament dissolved.

Queen Charlotte died at Kew Palace on the 17th of November. She had been for fifty-eight years the exemplary, virtuous wife of George III. Her example had indisputably been most beneficial to the higher classes of the country ; and the noble self-devoted way in which she performed her duties to the poor, blind, distraught king ought to bury in oblivion the few foibles, or narrow unamiable qualities she possessed.

Notwithstanding various plots and attempts at revolt made by the fanatic or impoverished and desperate partisans of the captive of St. Helena, France seemed settling into tranquillity and prosperity. Louis XVIII. respected the constitutional charter, and was liberal-minded and *well-intentioned* ; the foreign army of occupation, *commanded by the Duke of Wellington*, though composed of

men of various nations, had preserved the most admirable discipline, and had even endeavoured to avoid giving any offence to the susceptible pride or vanity of the French people. By the original treaty this army of occupation was to be maintained five years in France, if it should be thought necessary to the stability of the Bourbon throne, to the tranquillity of the country, or to the repose of Europe; but the Emperor of Austria, the King of Prussia, the Emperor of Russia, with their respective ministers, and the Duke of Wellington, and the ministers of some other powers, having assembled in Congress at Aix-la-Chapelle in the autumn of the present year, agreed that the army of occupation might be withdrawn at once—three years having elapsed since it had been agreed to leave these troops in the quality of an army of occupation. And orders were issued that those troops should be marched out of France by the 30th of November, or earlier, if possible; and that the forts they had occupied should be given up to commissioners appointed by his most Christian majesty in the same state they were in when the foreigners first took possession of them. Not halting in their generosity, the allied powers conceded other indulgences to the French; and England agreed to allow them more time for the payment of their instalments. The army of occupation had scarcely crossed the frontiers ere the French began to declare that their departure had been hastened only by a dread of their just vengeance, and their secret societies began anew to plot and conspire.

The energetic Governor-General of India, Earl Moira (now Marquess of Hastings), seconded by the energy and ability of Sir John Malcolm, the Honourable Mountstuart Elphinstone, Sir Thomas Hislop, Brigadier-General Smith, Captain Stanton, and a host of officers civil and military, such as have rarely been engaged on one object, or employed simultaneously under any government, Indian or European, had by this time not only put down the Pindarrees for ever, and captured or destroyed all the *leaders of those barbarous hordes*, but had also *shivered to pieces the foul confederacy of the Mahrattas*

—a confederacy which had been for ages fatal to the tranquillity and prosperity of a vast portion of Hindostan. Battles were fought, marches were made, and sieges undertaken, which were all of the most brilliant or most romantic kind. “Thirty hill-fortresses, each of which might have defied the whole Anglo-Indian army, fell in the course of a few weeks; and this vast Mahratta empire, which had overshadowed the East, and before which the star of the Mogul had become pale, was annihilated.”*

A.D. 1819.—The new parliament assembled on the 14th of January: it was opened by commission. The opposition had not gained by the late election. Mr. Manners Sutton was re-elected Speaker without competition. The royal speech congratulated parliament on the evacuation of France, on the brilliant successes in the East Indies, and on a considerable and progressive improvement of the revenues in its most important branches. “Under the provident and skilful superintendence of the Marquess of Hastings,” said the speech, “the campaign was marked, in every point, by brilliant achievements and successes; and his majesty’s forces and those of the East India Company (Native as well as European) rivalled each other in sustaining the reputation of the British arms.” After this the speech adverted to “reductions in the military and naval services,” and to the state of trade and manufactures, which was described as being most flourishing. Errors were pointed out in this last statement, and Lord Lansdowne showed that small retrenchments would be insufficient; that our expenditure still exceeded our income by fourteen millions a-year; but the addresses were agreed to without amendment or opposition.

The death of the queen rendered it necessary to appoint a new guardian of the king’s person. The choice naturally fell upon the Duke of York. All agreed that his royal highness was the fittest person that could be

* Edward Lake, Lieutenant of Madras Engineers, ‘*Journals of the Sieges of the Madras Army.*’—C. MacFarlane, ‘*Our Indian Empire.*’

selected; but some angry feelings were excited by ministers proposing that he should be allowed an additional 10,000*l.* a-year for taking care of, or paying occasional visits to, his own aged suffering father. Mr. Tierney said, "The royal duke's only duty to his afflicted father would be to go from London or Oatlands to Windsor once or twice a-week; and yet it was modestly proposed that he should be allowed 10,000*l.* a-year for the hire of post-horses." But Lord Castlereagh showed that her late majesty had been in receipt of that additional 10,000*l.*; that, by her majesty's death, and some alterations in the Windsor establishment, there was an immediate saving to the nation of 83,000*l.* per annum; and, in the end, the money was voted without a division to the Duke of York, who, through carelessness and prodigality, or proneness to be duped, was, as he always had been, in want of more money than he could obtain.

Unsuccessful, and perhaps premature, attempts were made during the session for the resumption of cash payments, and the discontinuance of the bank restriction. The principal debaters on the subject were Mr. Tierney, Mr. Grenfell, Mr. Brougham, Mr. Gurney, Lord A. Hamilton, Mr. Robert Peel, Lord Castlereagh, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, in the Lower House; and the Earl of Liverpool, Lord Harrowby, the Marquis of Lansdowne, and Earl Grey, in the Lords.

On the 2nd of March Sir James Mackintosh delivered a learned and luminous discourse on the actual state of our criminal law, and moved the appointment of a select committee to inquire into so much thereof as related to capital punishment in felonies. Lord Castlereagh moved the previous question, but Sir James's motion was carried by 147 against 128.

A bill was passed to authorise Lord Camden's sacrifice of his salary of 9000*l.* a-year as a sinecure teller of the exchequer. It has been conjectured that the sanction of an act of Parliament was intended to give solemnity and *éclat* to his lordship's deed, to serve as an example for *other sinecurists*; but as an example it *failed*.

The fresh reductions made in our army left a great number of young officers unemployed and ill provided for. A good many of these went out to join the South American independents. The Spanish ambassador in London complained of this as an infringement of the friendly relations between Great Britain and Spain ; and an infringement it undoubtedly was. An act was passed against enlistments, or naval equipments, for the service of any foreign state whatsoever. But it was most difficult to carry this act into execution, or to prevent the departure of men and officers who were not of necessity obliged to reveal the place of their final destination. Government perhaps did not take any extraordinary degree of unnecessary pains to prevent these departures. If government had listened to the manufacturing and commercial interests, which were backed by no inconsiderable portion of the public press, the independence of the states of South America would have been acknowledged before this present year was over. Though the struggle was far from being over, those insurgent states had made some progress ; and a large armament, which had long been fitting out at Cadiz to recover possession of the whole of Spanish America, was soon frustrated by a mutiny of the troops.

The Imperial Parliament was prorogued by the Regent in person on the 13th of July. His royal highness bestowed much praise on the patient and laborious investigation of the state of the circulation and currency of the kingdom ; and expressed a confident expectation that the most beneficial consequence would result from this inquiry. He had once again to deplore that attempts had been recently made in some of the manufacturing districts to take advantage of circumstances of local distress, to excite a spirit of disaffection to the institutions and government of the country.

Meetings had been held near Leeds, at Stockport, and some other places, to petition for annual parliaments and *universal suffrage* ; and these meetings had, in some instances, been very noisy, if not riotous. About a week before the prorogation of parliament Lord Sidmouth had

issued circular letters to the lords-lieutenants, recommending that prompt and effectual measures should be employed for the preservation of the public tranquillity, and that the yeomanry should hold themselves in readiness to act in case of need. Although more constitutional, this civic force, whenever called upon to act, or brought into collision with a mob, would be sure to display far less patience, forbearance, and moderation than regular troops.

A few days after the prorogation a great radical meeting was held in Smithfield, under the presidency of Mr. Orator Hunt. Fears were entertained; but 6000 special constables were sworn in to preserve the peace of the city; some of the Guards were kept ready in their barracks, and, except a terrible sacrifice made of the king's English by some of the spouting demagogues, little mischief was perpetrated. The storm raged most fiercely in Lancashire. On the 21st of July a constable who had arrested that very radical, indiscreet, and violent baronet, Sir Charles Wolseley, for sedition, was openly shot in the streets of Stockport. The cotton-spinners had betaken themselves to an imitation of the early French revolutionists and Jacobins. A *female* reform society was opened at Blackburn, from which circular letters were issued, inviting the wives and daughters of workmen to form *sister-societies*, for the purpose of co-operating with the men, and instilling into the minds of their children "a deep-rooted hatred of our tyrannical rulers." Mock legislative bodies were formed. In various places men and boys were training themselves to the use of the pike. It is utterly impossible to deny that some of these misled people entertained desperate designs. We have their own confessions to the fact; and in many instances these confessions have been voluntary—have not been extorted by any violence or ingenuity of court-lawyers' tongues, but have been given from the persuasions of conscience and the convictions of an improved intellect.*

On the 30th of July a proclamation was issued by the

* See particularly, 'Memoirs of a Radical,' by Bamford.

Regent against military training, seditious meetings, and writings, and the election of "legislatorial attorneys."

At this very juncture, a congress of the continental powers, assembled at Carlsbad, issued some very strong resolutions, denouncing the liberty of the press, and liberal opinions in general. Ever since the formation of the so-called Holy Alliance, and the return of Lord Castlereagh from the Congress of Vienna, our ultra-Whig and Radical newspapers had been in the habit of representing the Regent as a member of that alliance (which he was not, and could not be), and of accusing Castlereagh and the rest of the ministers of following the example and identifying themselves with the cabinets of the unconstitutional, absolute sovereigns of the Continent. People end in believing a falsehood which is frequently repeated. The radicals verily believed that Castlereagh and Sidmouth were in a league against the liberty of the press and all the freedom of the country; and the appearance of the resolutions of the congress of Carlsbad, and the comments that were lavished upon them, produced a new excitement among the party who claimed the title of liberals.

On the 9th of August, the Manchester reformers having convened a great public meeting, with the object of proceeding, in their own way, to the choice and election of a parliamentary representative, they were apprized by the magistrates that the object was illegal, and that such meeting was illegal; upon which the design was modified, and a meeting convened for the 16th to petition for a sweeping reform in parliament.

A little before noon on the 16th, the first body of reformers began to arrive on the scene of action, which was a piece of ground called St. Peter's Field. These persons bore two banners, surmounted with caps of liberty, and bearing the inscriptions — "No Corn Laws," "Annual Parliaments," "Universal Suffrage," "Vote by Ballot." These flags, after being paraded round the field, were planted on a waggon, on which *the orators* of the day had taken their stand; but *other flags* appeared and remained stationary in dif-

ferent parts of the crowd. Numerous large bodies of radicals continued to arrive from the towns in the neighbourhood of Manchester till about one o'clock, and they were all preceded by flags, and many of them came up in regular marching order, five deep, as if they had been well drilled and trained. Two clubs of female reformers advanced, one of them numbering more than 150 members, and bearing a white silk banner. There was a body of reformers who timed their steps to the sound of a bugle, with much of a disciplined air: there was another that had assumed the motto of the illustrious Wallace, "God armeth the Patriot." The multitude now amounted to a number roundly computed at 80,000. The arrival of the hero of the day was impatiently expected by the radicals. Nothing less than a fearful riot, with murder and plunder, was expected by the merchants, millowners, and the prosperous classes generally. At last Orator Hunt made his appearance, and after a rapturous greeting was invited to preside. Mounting a scaffolding, he began to harangue his admirers. A band of special constables, who had taken up a position on the field without resistance, now disposed themselves so as to form a line of communication from a house where the magistrates were sitting to the stage or platform erected for Mr. Hunt. The orator had not proceeded far when the appearance of the yeomanry cavalry advancing at a brisk trot excited a panic in the outskirts of the meeting. The civic force entered the enclosure, and after pausing for a minute to recover their disordered ranks, they drew their swords and brandished them in the air. The multitude, by the direction of their leaders, gave three cheers, to show that they were undaunted by this intrusion, and the orator had just resumed his speech to assure the people that this was only a trick to disturb the meeting, and to exhort them to stand firm, when the yeomanry dashed into the crowd, making for the platform. That immense mob offered no resistance; they fell back on all sides, overturning one another. The commanding officer approached Orator Hunt, and brandishing his sword, told

him that he was his prisoner. Mr. Hunt, after enjoining the people to tranquillity, said that he would readily surrender to any civil officer on his showing his warrant. Mr. Nodin, the principal police-officer, then stepped forward, and, producing his warrant, quietly received Hunt into custody. A few other persons, against whom warrants had been issued, were likewise apprehended; others who stood in the same predicament escaped in the crowd. Some of the yeomanry then cried out, "Have at their flags!" and upon this the troop began to strike down the banners, raised in various parts of the fields, cutting to right and left to get at them. The people scampered off in all directions, and the yeomanry spurred after them, losing all command of temper. There was then a dreadful scene of confusion: numbers were trampled under the feet of men and horses; many women as well as men were cut down by sabres; several were slain on the spot, and among these were a peace-officer and a female—for the undisciplined heroes scarcely knew what they were doing, and slew where they wished to save. The whole number of persons more or less injured was set down at between 300 and 400; but it should appear that this number is exaggerated by the suffering party, and that nine-tenths of the injuries received were of a very trifling nature. In their retreat the reformers threw stones and brick-bats at the yeomanry. It is said that some stones were discharged in the same direction before the yeomen charged the people, and that the Riot Act was read by the magistrates before a sword was used; but some doubt rests upon one if not upon both of these assertions. The yeomanry was chiefly composed of a set of hot-headed young men belonging to rich families, who entertained a too great contempt and dislike of spinners and weavers and dyers, machine-makers, and other artisans, who made up the reform assemblage. The Riot Act *was* read, but it seems to have been read when nobody could hear it. In less than ten minutes from the first charge of the yeomanry, the ground was entirely cleared of its former occupants, and was filled by various bodies of military,

both horse and foot. Mr. Orator Hunt, with the broken staves of two of his banners carried in mock procession before him, was hurried before the magistrates, who sent him to prison on a charge of high treason. He was soon locked up in a solitary cell; and the other prisoners were confined with the same precaution. Before night the town of Manchester was brought into a tolerably quiet state, military patrols being stationed at the end of almost every street.

On the arrival in London of a despatch from the local authorities, a cabinet council was held, which, on *ex parte* statements, too precipitately directed letters of thanks to be forwarded to the Manchester magistrates for their prompt, decisive, and efficient measures; and to all the military engaged, for the support and assistance rendered by them to the civil power.

At a numerous meeting held at the Crown and Anchor in London, a series of resolutions were adopted, strongly censuring the conduct of the magistrates as well as the military, and returning thanks to Hunt and his colleagues. It was also determined that a subscription should be raised for defraying the legal expenses of the prisoners. In the same spirit a meeting was held in Smithfield, and a violent letter addressed to the electors of Westminster by Sir Francis Burdett, for the writing of which the baronet was afterwards convicted as a libeller. In pursuance of this letter, an immense multitude assembled in Palace Yard, Westminster, on the 2nd of September. The principal orators were Sir Francis Burdett, and Mr. John Cam Hobhouse, his colleague in the representation of Westminster; violent resolutions were adopted; the affair of Petersfield was called a massacre and a foul attempt to destroy by the sword the few remaining liberties of Englishmen; and an address to the Regent, founded on these resolutions, was agreed to. Similar meetings were held in the city of London, Glasgow, York, Bristol, Liverpool, Norwich, and Nottingham. The York meeting was sanctioned by the presence of Earl Fitzwilliam, lord-lieutenant of the West Riding, *who, in consequence, was dismissed from his high office.*

To counteract these meetings, loyal addresses and offers to raise yeomanry corps were zealously promoted by the friends of the administration. Lord Sidmouth formed a large veteran battalion by calling out the Chelsea pensioners. The coroners' inquests which were held at Manchester on the bodies of the slain would on no account implicate either the magistracy or the yeomanry; and such verdicts were given as afforded no basis for judicial proceedings. It was soon found necessary to abandon the capital charge of treason. All the prisoners availed themselves of the privilege of traversing till the spring assizes of 1820, and instead of Lancaster the trial took place at York. After ten days' duration the trial closed on the 10th of April, when the jury declared "Hunt, Johnson, Knight, Healy, and Bamford, guilty of collecting with unlawful banners an assembly for the purpose of moving and inciting the liege subjects of our Sovereign Lord the King into contempt and hatred of the government and constitution of the realm," &c. In the ensuing term they received sentence; Hunt to be imprisoned in the jail of Ilchester two years and a half, and then to find securities for his good behaviour during five years; Johnson, Knight, Healy, and Bamford to be imprisoned one year in Lincoln castle, and also to find sureties.

In the midst of a general ferment, parliament assembled prematurely for the dispatch of business before Christmas. On the 23rd of November the Regent opened the session by a speech full of alarm, and which announced that an addition of 11,000 men to the military force had been deemed indispensable. Lord Grey moved an amendment to the address, throwing upon government the whole blame of the melancholy events at Manchester, and declaring that meeting to have been strictly legal. His lordship's amendment was negatived, and the address agreed to by 159 to 34. A similar amendment proposed in the Commons by Mr. Tierney was equally unsuccessful. The influence of ministers was no doubt *great over the present parliament; but it can scarcely be denied that the great majority of votes proceeded from*

a sincere conviction that radical meetings, political clubs, and radical projects were threatening the country with civil war and revolution—with the most horrible of wars, a war of the poor against the rich, or a conflict between those who had some property and those who had none. But this conviction, this fear, did as usual carry men into the risk of another great danger. To curb the temporarily-excited people they were but too ready to place an undue power in the hands of ministers. The well known “Six Acts” were introduced, and were carried by large majorities through both Houses. In the Lords they were proposed by Viscount Sidmouth; in the Commons by Lord Castlereagh. They consisted of the following bills:—1. To take away the right of traversing in cases of misdemeanour. 2. To punish any person, found guilty on a second conviction of libel, by fine, imprisonment, and banishment for life. 3. For preventing seditious meetings, requiring the names of seven householders to the requisition which in future convened any meeting for the discussion of subjects connected with Church or State. 4. To prohibit military training, except under the authority of a magistrate or lord-lieutenant. 5. To subject cheap periodical pamphlets on political subjects to a duty similar to that on newspapers. 6. To give magistrates the power of entering houses by *night* or by day, for the purpose of seizing arms believed to be collected for unlawful purposes.—The only one of these bills which passed without opposition was that for the prevention of secret military training. The entering of houses by night, and the restrictions on the press, were strongly objected to. These acts were to continue in force for the term of five years. On the 30th of December parliament adjourned to the 15th of February.

A.D. 1820.—The opening of another stormy year was clouded by death. On the 23rd of January the Duke of Kent, fourth son of George III., died of pulmonary inflammation, produced by a neglected cold caught while shooting. *His infant daughter*—now Queen Victoria—*was then only a few months old.* On the 28th of the

same month died George III., at Windsor, in the 82nd year of his age, and the 60th of his reign. For many years he had been as one dead and entombed in the castle: deafness had been superadded to blindness and his other infirmities; but he died of natural decay, and without any visible pain. The Duke of York, Lords Henley and Winchelsea, and General Sir Herbert Taylor were present when he expired.

On Monday the 31st of January, George IV. was proclaimed with the usual forms. On the same day the members of parliament were sworn in, when they prolonged their adjournment to the 17th of February. During the recess his majesty had so severe an inflammation of the chest that his life was for some days considered in danger.

The demise of the Crown must by our constitution be followed by a dissolution of parliament within the next six months. When the two Houses assembled a royal message announced the design of calling a new parliament immediately, and invited the Houses to concur in the necessary arrangements for carrying on the public service during the interval. When the supplies were brought under discussion Mr. Joseph Hume took occasion to introduce a very embarrassing subject. Caroline, Princess of Wales, had been residing on the Continent ever since the year 1814, and had there conducted herself in a manner to bring down disgrace on her own illustrious family, and on the great country with which she was connected by her marriage. Long previously to her departure from England there had been "delicate investigations" into her conduct; and recently measures had been taken to ascertain the amount of her guilt, or imprudence and recklessness, in Italy. In the altered Liturgy her name was no longer prayed for. Mr. Hume censured this omission, maintaining that the Princess, as lawful, undivorced wife of George IV., was now Queen. He said that her former allowance had of course ceased on the late king's demise; and he asked whether she, as *Queen of Great Britain and Ireland*, was to be left to *wander in beggary through foreign lands?* Lord Castle-

reagh endeavoured to evade this delicate subject; and he merely assured the House that the "exalted personage" under consideration should suffer no pecuniary difficulties. Parliament was prorogued by commission on the 28th of February, and was dissolved the same day.

The prorogation speech ended with these words:—"If any doubt had remained as to the nature of those principles by which the peace and happiness of the nation were so seriously menaced, or of the excesses to which they were likely to lead, *the flagrant and sanguinary conspiracy* which has lately been detected must open the eyes of the most incredulous, and must vindicate to the whole world the justice and expediency of those measures to which you judged it necessary to resort in defence of the laws and constitution of the kingdom." The conspiracy here referred to was that of Thistlewood and his accomplices, in all a band of about a score or two desperadoes, some of whom had been captured by the police and military on the night of the 23rd of February in a very obscure street, called Cato Street, near the Edgeware Road, in the north-western suburb of London. The plot of these men was as frantic as it was horrible. They were to murder the ministers of the Crown while sitting at a cabinet dinner at the house of Lord Harrowby; and, this bloody exploit being achieved, they were to raise the standard of insurrection, to seize the Bank and the Tower, to set fire to London in various places, and to constitute themselves the heads of a provisional government. Associated with these mad assassins was a certain Edwards, a spy, who had been for some time in the pay of Lord Sidmouth, but who had skill enough to pass with them as the most trusty of colleagues, and most decided and most daring of revolutionists. This Edwards had kept government minutely informed of all the projects and movements of the gang; and it was in consequence of his revelations that arrangements were made for surprising the criminals in their den, at the very moment they were to issue from it for the perpetration of their crime. *This den was a hay-loft over a stable. A party of*

police, and a detachment of 30 of the Coldstream Guards, headed by Captain Fitzclarence (afterwards Lord Munster), arrived at the stable at about eight o'clock. Two small candles in the loft were upset and extinguished; there was a scuffle in the dark; Smithers, an active police-officer, was run through the body by Thistlewood; Sergeant Legge was wounded by a pistol shot; and Captain Fitzclarence had two very narrow escapes. Nine of the conspirators were taken with arms in their hands. The rest, favoured by the darkness, escaped by dashing down the ladder, or by forcing their way out of a window at the back of the loft. Thistlewood, the chief, was not taken that night, but a reward of 1000*l.* being offered for his apprehension, his hiding-place was revealed, and he was seized next morning in bed. This man—and only he of all the gang—had originally belonged to a respectable class of society. Arthur Thistlewood had borne the king's commission, and had once served as a subaltern officer in the West Indies. The want of promotion had soured his temper, and a sojourn in the United States of America had infected him with a mania for democracy. He had finished his political education among the revolutionists of Paris, in which city he is said to have resided during Robespierre's Reign of Terror. The chief of his accomplices were Ings, a butcher; Tidd and Brant, poor shoemakers; and Davidson, a wretched, destitute man of colour.

The prisoners, to the number of eleven, were tried at the Old Bailey in the month of April, and Thistlewood, Ings, Tidd, Brant, and Davidson were executed as traitors on the 1st of May. Adams, one of the party, had been allowed to turn king's evidence; the others having withdrawn their original plea, and pleaded guilty, were sentenced to transportation for life; but evidence being produced to prove that one of these had been ignorant of the worst parts of the Cato-street plot, the man eventually received a free pardon.

The elections were on the whole favourable to *ministers*. The new parliament met on the 21st of April, when Mr. Manners Sutton was once more re-elected

Speaker. The session was opened on the 27th by the king in person, the intervening days having been employed in swearing in the members. His majesty disclaimed any wish of increasing his income by the imposition of new burthens. He said that the wisdom and firmness of the legislature, and the due execution of the laws, had contributed to restore confidence throughout the kingdom, and to discountenance those principles of sedition and irreligion which had been disseminated with such malignant perseverance, and had poisoned the minds of the ignorant and unwary. "I rely," continued the speech, "upon the continued support of parliament in my determination to maintain, by all the means intrusted to my hands, the public safety and tranquillity."

"Deploring, as we all must, the distress which still unhappily prevails among many of the labouring classes of the community, and anxiously looking forward to its removal or mitigation, it is in the meantime our common duty effectually to protect the loyal, the peaceable, and the industrious, against those practices of turbulence and intimidation, by which the period of relief can only be deferred, and by which the pressure of the distress has has been incalculably aggravated." [Since the arrest of the Cato-street conspirators there had been midnight training and rioting in the West Riding of Yorkshire, and disturbances and even conflicts with the yeomanry and regular troops, at Falkirk, Glasgow, and other places in Scotland.]

In both Houses the addresses were voted without a dissenting voice. At an early part of the session Mr. Brougham introduced his great plan for the education of the poor. This bill being read a first time without opposition was postponed by mutual agreement to the next session. Sir Samuel Romilly had laboured for years in the noble vocation for reforming the criminal laws, and striking out of them the bloody statutes which disgraced the country and were repulsive to all humanity. *Sir Samuel had died an unhappy death, and the eloquent and accomplished Sir James Mackintosh had taken up*

his mission; and he now submitted six bills, three of which passed the Commons intact, but were much altered in their way through the House of Lords.

Manufacturing distress was already mitigated, but there was considerable agricultural distress. A committee was appointed to inquire into the causes of this evil, and the discussions and examinations did something to prepare the minds of the government and community for a gradual approach to free trade. Before the end of the session, Mr. Wallace, vice-president of the board of trade, introduced into the House of Commons a wholesome measure for relaxing the navigation laws and warehousing system: this measure was passed into a law.

The civil list was settled at 1,057,000*l*. The budget of the year was chiefly distinguished by the chancellor of the exchequer borrowing 12,000,000*l*. from the sinking fund, and 5,000,000*l*. by private contract.

Towards the end of May a fresh excitement was created by the intelligence that Caroline Princess of Wales was travelling from Italy to England, with the resolution of claiming all her rights. Mr. Brougham, her principal legal adviser, received her commands to meet her in France. He left London on the 1st of June, bearing the following proposition to the queen, which had been placed in his hands by Lord Liverpool, the premier: "The king is willing to recommend to parliament to enable his majesty to settle an annuity of 50,000*l*. a-year upon the queen, to be enjoyed by her during her natural life, and in lieu of any claim in the nature of jointure or otherwise, provided she will engage not to come into any part of the British dominions, and provided she engages to take some other name or title than that of queen, and not to exercise any of the rights or privileges of queen, either with respect to the appointment of law officers, or to any proceedings in courts of justice. The annuity to cease upon the violation of these engagements, viz., upon her coming into any part of the *British dominions*; or her assuming the title of queen; or *her exercising any of the rights or privileges of queen, other*

than above excepted, after the annuity shall have been settled upon her."

Lord Hutchinson, as one who had friendly relations as well with the king as with the queen or princess, accompanied Mr. Brougham as a mediator. They arrived at St. Omer on the 3rd of June. Lord Hutchinson could not but tell the princess that there was no hope of her ever being admitted Queen of England. He farther told her that his majesty's ministers proposed that 50,000*l.* per annum should be settled upon her for life, subject to such conditions as the king might impose; that he had reason to know that the conditions likely to be imposed by his majesty were, that she was not to assume the title of Queen of England, or any title attached to the royal family, and that she was not to reside in any part of the United Kingdom, or even to visit England. His lordship also quoted a letter from Lord Liverpool to himself, in which the premier said—"It is material that her majesty should know confidentially, that if she be so ill-advised as to come over to this country, there must then be *an end to all negotiations and compromise*. The decision, I may say, is taken to proceed against her as soon as she sets her foot on the British shore."*

The princess, who ever proclaimed that she was supported by the consciousness of her own innocence, rejected these propositions with disdain, and declared that she would presently be in England to confront her enemies, and to appeal to a generous people. She was at Calais, on her way to London, on the 5th of June, and the intelligence was conveyed to Whitehall by telegraph. A cabinet council was assembled hereupon, and it sat through nearly the whole night. On the next morning—the morning of the 6th—the king went in state to give the royal assent to such bills as had passed parliament; and, this being done, he left Lord Liverpool to deliver the following message to the Lords:—"The king thinks it necessary, in consequence of the arrival of the queen,

* Letter from Lord Hutchinson to Mr. Brougham.

to communicate to the House of Lords certain papers respecting the conduct of her majesty since her departure from this kingdom, which he recommends to the immediate and serious attention of this House.

“The king has felt the most anxious desire to avert the necessity of disclosures and discussions which must be as painful to his people as they can be to himself; but the step now taken by the queen leaves him no alternative.

“The king has the fullest confidence that, in consequence of this communication, the House of Lords will adopt that course of proceeding which the justice of the case, and the honour and dignity of his majesty’s crown, may require. GEORGE R.”

The papers referred to were laid on the table in a green bag, which was sealed. This was the famous green bag which made such a figure in the chronicles of the day. A similar message was delivered to the Commons by Lord Castlereagh. Both ministers announced the intention to move an address to the king, and to refer the papers to a secret committee on the following day. The Lords were silent; but in the Commons there was some vehement debate. On the 7th Lord Liverpool proposed that the papers should be submitted to a secret committee of fifteen peers, to be appointed by ballot. Lord Liverpool, however, announced that the course to be pursued against the queen could not be an impeachment for treasonable conspiracy, seeing that Bergami, the alleged partner in her guilt, being an alien, was not amenable as a traitor to the crown of England; and that to constitute conspiracy there must be at least two criminals. The secret committee was appointed by ballot on the following day.

While this was passing in the Lords there was another vehement debate in the Commons. Mr. Brougham presented a message from the queen, which set forth that she had come to claim her rights and maintain her innocence; that she protested against a secret tribunal appointed by her accusers: and finally, that she appealed to the justice of the House of Commons. Lord Castle-

reagh declared that ministers were neither persecutors nor prosecutors in this matter; and that the illustrious personage would not and could not be judged without an open inquiry and examination of witnesses. Mr. Canning, who entertained a kind and generous feeling towards the princess, whose misfortunes surpassed her offences, solemnly vowed that he would never place himself in the situation of her accuser. The same eminent orator and statesman declared that he would take no farther share in these deliberations; and, finding the cabinet resolved to proceed, he very soon resigned his office.* Mr. Wilberforce moved the adjournment of the question to the next day but one, in the hope that during the interval some amicable arrangement might prevent a disgusting investigation, which might go far to taint the public morals, and which could not but degrade the two contending parties—the king as well as the queen. This motion was agreed to, and for several days there was silence in the House upon the subject.

Caroline of Brunswick had landed at Dover from the ordinary packet on the 6th, accompanied by Alderman Wood and Lady Hamilton. Her entry into London was a kind of triumph, for she was received with joyful acclamations by the common people, and an immense mob followed her carriage, shouting “The queen for ever!” and heaping vituperations and curses upon the heads of her husband’s ministers. On the 14th, the somewhat radically composed common council of the city of London presented an address congratulating her majesty on her arrival in this country. The example was speedily followed, and for many months the metropolis was kept in a ferment by addresses and processions, got up by all manner of people, of trades, and of bodies corporate and not corporate, in honour of the queen’s happy return. In truth, from the first moment of her arrival, all the discontented and disaffected, all the radicals and all the reformers of whatsoever kind, all who wished for change, and all who wished for com-

* In the autumn of 1816 Mr. Canning had accepted office as president of the board of control.

motion and strife, rallied round this hapless, reckless woman. The cries for annual parliaments, universal suffrage, and vote by ballot, were all drowned in the louder shouts of "Long live the queen!" "God save the queen, and destroy her enemies!" For any one to have intimated in the streets of London a suspicion of her innocence and spotless purity, would have been to make a very perilous experiment on the popular temper. It was very soon observed that the hosts of her admirers and champions were not made up of the respectabilities, and that the most ardent of her followers and processionists marched from the lower parts of the town, from St. Giles's and the Whitechapel suburb. With a very few exceptions, the ladies of rank, station, and character were exceedingly shy of her, whatever may have been the Whig politics of their husbands, or the speeches by them delivered in parliament; and the warmest of her supporters and panegyrists in the two Houses showed no anxiety that their wives and daughters should visit her majesty in her own house. By a certain party, or rather by two certain parties—the Whigs and the Radicals—she was seized upon as an instrument proper to work out their own designs. They calculated that through her means the unpopularity of the king might be brought to a climax, and the long-seated ministry utterly overthrown. They were therefore determined from the first to set their faces against any amicable arrangement or compromise; to support her flagging spirits by incessant addresses, processions, and highly-seasoned compliments, and to prevent, by every means in their power, her withdrawing from the conflict. The celebrated radical writer, William Cobbett, employed his energetic pen in writing letters to her majesty. He told her that an offer said to have been made in her name to quit the country had filled the women's eyes with tears, and the men's hearts with a feeling which never before existed in them with regard to her majesty; that no terms, no conditions, no qualifications could, in the public estimation, remove the impression which her consenting to abandon the country must necessarily make; and that he could

clearly foresee, but had not the heart to describe, the fatal consequences which must follow her departure. They had brought her to the stake, and they were resolutely determined upon keeping her at it. Yet, apart from these political views, and wholly unconnected with them, there was a strong and generous feeling in a very considerable part of the community in favour of the unhappy princess. The heart of the people revolted at anything like oppression exercised upon a woman; her illustrious birth, the misfortunes of her family (her father and her brother had both fallen in battle during the late revolutionary war), her own misfortunes and sorrows, which had commenced from the hour of her union with George, Prince of Wales; her natural kindness, benevolence, and generosity of disposition; the long state of abandonment in which she had been left by her husband; her husband's youthful profligacy, the irregularities of his mature age, and certain connexions which he was notoriously maintaining at the very moment he was causing his wife to be charged with adultery;—all these, and many other facts and circumstances, pleaded powerfully in behalf of Caroline of Brunswick.

The utter failure of the attempt to arbitrate was announced to the House of Commons on the 19th of June. Upon this the government pressed proceedings. On the 26th of June, whilst the secret committee was still sitting, Lord Dacre presented a petition from the queen, in which she protested against any secret inquiry, demanded time to bring her witnesses from abroad, and requested to be heard by her counsel. Messrs. Brougham, Denman, and Williams, being allowed to present themselves at the bar of the House, dwelt eloquently upon the hardships of the queen's case, and on the necessity of delay. On the 4th of July the secret committee gave in its report. On the next day Lord Dacre presented a petition from the queen to be heard against the report by her counsel. This was refused; and Lord Liverpool, in pursuance of the report, brought in a bill of pains and penalties, intituled "*An Act to deprive Her Majesty Queen Caroline Amelia Elizabeth of the Title, Pre-*

rogatives, Rights, Privileges, and Exemptions of Queen Consort of this Realm, and to dissolve the Marriage between His Majesty and the said Caroline Amelia Elizabeth." The bill was read a first time, and a copy of it was ordered to be sent to the queen.

We have no space for details of proceedings, or for the eloquent pleadings of Brougham and Denman. On the 19th of August Lords Grey and King made successive attempts to quash the investigation by motions; but the respective divisions were 181 to 65, and 179 to 64. After these divisions had taken place, the attorney-general stated his case in support of the bill. His statement occupied two days, the 19th and 21st of August. As it was ending, on the 21st, drums, trumpets, horns, and the shoutings of a tremendous multitude, announced the approach of her majesty. She entered the House of Lords. Then, in her presence, the examination of witnesses was commenced; and then—in a very few minutes—there was an incident and a scene. Upon hearing the clerk of the House call the name of Teodoro Majocchi, the third witness, the queen started from her seat with a faint cry, and rushed out of the House. This man had been her servant, and a close eye-witness of most of her proceedings for a long time. It was assumed by some that her emotion and her cry proceeded from conscious guilt taken by surprise at the production of such a witness; it was reasoned by others that she might have been excited only by disgust and indignation at the ingratitude and treachery of an old servant.

The scandalous investigation went on, and day by day the disgusting reports of proceedings and examination of witnesses filled the newspapers; until it came to this—men who regarded the purity of their wives and daughters interdicted the journals in their houses. On the 7th of September the case against the queen was closed; and an adjournment took place to allow time to her counsel for preparing her defence. On the 3rd of October, Mr. Brougham delivered the defence at great length and with astonishing eloquence and effect. He was ably followed by Mr. Williams. The examina-

tion of the queen's witnesses continued to the 24th of October. When it was closed, Mr. Denman went over the whole case with vast ability, and with equal boldness. The witnesses against the queen had in some instances prevaricated ; and, although a good deal of their testimony was perfectly convincing (and particularly to such persons as had lived in Italy and were conversant with Italian manners), the case, in the apprehension of what was perhaps the majority of the nation, was left in that state which Scotch lawyers call " not proven." Yet none but political fanatics or utter enthusiasts in generosity and charity could doubt but that this daughter of a most ancient and illustrious house had, during her foreign sojourn and rambles, behaved with the greatest levity and indecorum. Those who judged of her with most severity were travellers who had followed her footsteps, or who had lived in Italy at the time that she had resided in that country ; those who judged most favourably of her were such as had never quitted their own shores, who knew nothing of foreign life, and who knew nothing of her foreign story except what they took upon trust from the newspapers of the day. Dr. Lushington supported Mr. Denman. The king's attorney and solicitor general occupied the 27th, 28th, 29th, and 30th, in replying. The bill of pains and penalties was read a second time on the 6th of November, by a majority of 123 to 95. The house having gone into committee, a discussion was raised on the divorce clause of the bill. Some bishops, and other supporters of the bill, resisted this clause from religious scruples, or from the dread that the queen would recriminate upon her husband. In fact, such recrimination had been threatened by Mr. Brougham at the very outset of the proceedings. But a parliamentary manœuvre was resorted to ; the opposition peers voted for the divorce clause, and it was carried by a majority of 120 to 62. This majority proved highly injurious on the third reading. Many peers who would have voted for the bill without the divorce clause voted against it when the divorce clause was made a part of the bill ; and thus, on the 10th of November, the third reading was carried by only nine votes, the numbers dividing being 108 against

99. Lord Liverpool declared that, looking at this small majority, and at the state of the public feeling, he and his colleagues abandoned the bill. The House adjourned to the 26th of November. On that day, just as Mr. Denman was commencing to read a message from the queen, the usher of the black rod presented himself at the bar; and at this unexpected apparition, the Speaker left the chair, and, followed by ministers and the members of the ministerial party, proceeded to the House of Lords, there to be informed that the session of parliament was prorogued by his majesty. And thus ended, in defeat and disgrace to the king, an indecent, obscene contest, which had filled right-minded men with unutterable disgust, which had supplied most abundant and congenial materials to the lubricous pens and tongues of the French, and which had made every Englishman residing or travelling on the Continent hold down his head and blush for his sovereign and his country.

During the year that Continent was shaken by successive revolutions. They began in Spain. Ever since the restoration of Ferdinand VII. and his suppression of the Cortes and ill-framed constitution of 1812, there had been a contest *à l'outrance* between the absolutists and the liberals. Several unsuccessful attempts had been made for the restoration of the constitution, and Porlier, Lacy, and Vidal, who had risen in insurrection in different parts of the kingdom, had ended their days on the scaffold. The liberals had then recourse to clubs and secret societies, and to prevalent arts by which to win over the soldiery. The terrible losses sustained by the king's armies in South America, and the aversion of the Spaniards to be shipped off for that war, favoured the designs of the anti-absolutists. At the end of the year 1819, the troops assembled at Cadiz to be embarked for South America intimated that they would not go. On the 1st of January, 1820, four battalions proclaimed the constitution of 1812 at the Isla de Leon, and, with Riego at their head, marched through Andalusia, by Algeciras, and Malaga, and halted not until they had reached Cordova, in the very centre of the Peninsula. Risings of the liberals now took place in every quarter; the royal

troops sent against the insurgents joined their ranks and made common cause with them; and King Ferdinand was compelled to yield by accepting the constitution, proclaiming a general amnesty, and summoning the Cortes of 1812. With vehemence and short-sightedness common to Spanish politicians, the triumphant party drove on the wheel of revolution too far and too fast; they soon alienated the whole body of the clergy, and irritated the religious feelings and superstitions of the peasantry. A horrible civil war ensued. The liberal party was at this time strong only in the great towns.

From Spain the revolutionary spirit spread to Naples. For twenty years at least that beautiful Italian kingdom, so favoured by nature, and so misused by bad or unwise governments, had abounded in secret political societies. The Carbonari had been strong enough and bold enough to disquiet the last years of the reign of Murat. They had gained greater strength under the government of the restored Bourbon, old King Ferdinand, whose rule, from the day of his return in the summer of 1815, had been easy and mild. Certainly Ferdinand's government during this period was not the wisest that might have been found in Europe; but to stigmatize it as harsh or tyrannical must excite the derision of those who lived in the country between the summer of 1815 and the summer of 1820. Those five years were years of substantial happiness and of gradual improvement to the Neapolitan people. There was no longer a conscription; there was, at the end of the period, scarcely a remnant of national debt; the markets of Europe and of America were opened to the products of that rich soil; trade was, flourishing, the capital and most of the provincial towns were expanding, the builder was actively at work in them; there was no oppressive espionage; no irksome police, no rigid system of passports: men went and came freely in all parts of the kingdom. The Carbonari thought this too bad a state of things to last. They fancied that they could induce an instant, miraculous improvement; and *without reflecting on the hazards they ran, or on the utter inability of the country either to*

resist the power of Austria, or to furnish (all of a sudden) the proper materials for a constitutional form of government, they rushed headlong into revolution, and chose for themselves the worst constitution that existed in Europe.

The Carbonari might long have limited their efforts to speech-making, and to the performance of burlesque and half-impious ceremonies in their *vendite* or lodges; but the example of the Spanish liberals gave them encouragement, and taught them how to proceed. The Neapolitan soldiery were won over like the Spanish; and a second bad precedent was set of commencing a struggle for constitutional liberty by means of the armed class. The Neapolitans are by nature admirable mimics. On a fine summer night in the month of June, when their superior officers were away at Naples, enjoying their opera at San Carlo or their after-opera ices and promenade, two sub-lieutenants, Morelli and Silvati, and about forty men of a cavalry regiment quartered at Nola in Campania, broke out of barracks, and with arms and equipments trotted off to the small town of Monteforte, strongly situated in a mountain pass, through which runs the high road to Capitanata, Apulia, Terra d'Otranto, and other provinces. General William Pepe was sent by the astounded old king from Naples with a very considerable force; but Pepe and his troops, instead of scattering the insurgents, or making them prisoners, went over and joined them. Other generals and troops did the same; and when a great accession of force had come up from Apulia and Avellino, and when many thousands of civic Carbonari, armed with fowling-pieces, pistols, knives, or staves, flocked to the tricoloured flag, the torrent was poured from the mountains down to the plain of Campania Felix, and onward to the capital, where the Spanish constitution was proclaimed with wonderful noise and jubilation. We have been credibly informed that these constitutionists knew not what they were doing or to what they were swearing—that there was not at that time a single copy of the Spanish constitution to be found *in all Naples*. The court was in an agony of alarm, expecting *nothing less than the excesses which had attended the*

French revolution, and many of which were already attending the Spanish revolution. The king and his two sons took the oaths to the constitution in the church of the Holy Ghost. Old Ferdinand then retired from the regal office, naming his elder son Francis his Vicar General and Alter Ego. None of the excesses anticipated were committed. Although the royal family and the late ministers were in their hands and the whole country at their feet, the soldiery and the Carbonari were moderate, merciful, most gentle: they exercised no acts of vengeance, they scarcely offered so much as an insult, they respected the court while they were coercing it; they even buoyed themselves up with the hope that the royal family sincerely intended to stand by the constitution. Lamentable were the blunders they committed, and the mischiefs they brought down upon their country; but let these facts ever be remembered in honour of the poor Neapolitan revolutionists of 1820.

On the 30th of August, Portugal imitated Spain, a revolution commencing among the military, and a constitution being proclaimed by beat of drum. All these revolutions bore the closest family resemblance to one another; and they had all a bad origin and a bad basis. The sovereigns of the Continent trembled at the prevalence of military revolt; the so-called liberals rejoiced all over the world. In London meetings were held in taverns to celebrate the new birth of liberty in Naples, Spain, and Portugal; and here it was our ultra-Whigs and Radicals, who knew not what they were doing.

The Carbonari of Naples had correspondence with other societies in the Roman States, in Tuscany, in the dukedom of Modena, in Parma and Piacenza, in the Emperor of Austria's Lombardo-Venetian dominions, and in Piedmont; and now they dispatched propagandists and emissaries to all those parts of Italy to incite the clubbists to insurrection, and to teach them how to constitutionalize the soldiery. If Austria, propelled by her *fears of the contagion*, should throw an army towards *the south of Italy*, nothing could be so desirable to the

liberals as that the whole of the north of Italy should rise in the rear of that army. This was the one grand master-idea of the Carbonari; and in politics they had scarcely any other. The success of their emissaries was, however, but small and slow. The military insurrection at Turin, the capital of Piedmont, did not take place until the beginning of the following year. Meanwhile the sovereigns of Austria, Russia, and Prussia, met at Troppau, and invited King Ferdinand of Naples to join them "to consult on the means of promoting the tranquillity and happiness of nations." The Neapolitan parliament, which, like the Spanish Cortes of 1812, and like the Legislative Assembly of the French revolution, was all jumbled in one chamber, without an upper house, without a senate, without anything to stand between the representatives of the people and the sovereign power, were at first alarmed at the notion of the old king's departure; but Ferdinand protested and vowed that he was going only to maintain the cause of the constitution, and labour for the good of his people; and, as to restrain him from going must proclaim to the world that he was not a free agent, but a prisoner in the hands of the Carbonari, the parliament ultimately voted that he might go to Troppau and wherever he pleased. He took his departure for Leghorn in an English ship of the line—the flag-ship of our Admiral. On the night which preceded his embarkation, there was considerable ebullition and a near approach to a riot; for the Carbonari had small faith in the king's promises. From Troppau the sovereigns transferred their congress to Laybach, in order to be nearer to the Italian frontiers. The Neapolitan constitutional minister, the Duke de Gallo, who was sent by the parliament after the king, was not only refused admittance to the congress, but was ordered not to come near the town in which it was held.

A.D. 1821.—The session of parliament was opened on the 2nd of January by the king in person. The speech from the throne was very conciliating; and his majesty *had the good fortune* to be able to affirm that the *condition of the country* had rapidly improved and was still *improving*. Addresses were carried in both Houses

without opposition. Strong discussions followed on our foreign policy; the opposition expressing opinions very favourable to every one of the revolutions which had broken out in the south, and reviling with unseemly bitterness the Emperor of Austria and well-nigh every other sovereign in Europe. According to some of these orators, England ought to have made herself the champion of the Carbonari, and to have risked another universal war rather than permit the Austrians to march upon Naples. Yet by this time it ought to have been clear to the conception of every statesman that the Neapolitan revolution had no real hold on the popular mind in that country, or any part of the Italian peninsula. At first the poor Neapolitans fancied that the word "Constitution" signified the suspension of the Fondiaria, or land-tax, if not of all other imposts whatsoever. So soon as they found that they must continue to pay their taxes as before, and that there was an alarming prospect of increased taxation, they cared no more for the Constitution than for an old song. Moreover, as a body, or as two several bodies, the clergy and the monastic orders, whose influence over the common people was immense, were all for the old king and for absolutism.

The tables of both Houses continued to groan under heaps of interminable petitions in favour of Queen Caroline. A motion by Lord Archibald Hamilton for the insertion of her name in the liturgy was negatived by 310 against 209. The opening speech from the throne had recommended an adequate provision for her; but, by the organ of Mr. Brougham, she refused to accept of any money until she should be prayed for by name in the churches, and reinstated in all her rights. The keen pressure of poverty, however, soon shook her resolution, and she accepted 50,000*l.* a-year which was voted for her life. Other motions in her favour were made from time to time. She herself kept up the popular excitement by the violent unmeasured answers she returned to the mob addresses, these answers being always carefully printed in the *Whig and Radical journals*. It seemed as if the storm

would never end ; and, in reality, it ended only with her death and the removal of her body out of the country.

During the present session, two Bills in favour of the Roman Catholic claims were carried through the Commons, but were thrown out by the Lords by a majority of 159 to 120. On this occasion Mr. R. Peel appeared for the first time as the chief opponent of emancipation. A plan of parliamentary reform introduced by Mr. Lambton, (afterwards Lord Durham) without the slightest chance of success, was thrown out on the second reading by a little ministerial trick. On the 11th of July, while Mr. Hume was reading a resolution for an address to the king, praying that the queen might participate in the honours of the approaching coronation, the usher of the black rod tapped at the door and the session was prorogued.

Fruitless applications for a participation in the ceremony, or for a suitable place in the abbey to view the coronation, were made by the queen to the privy council, to Lord Sidmouth, to Lord Howard of Effingham, deputy-earl-marshal, and to the Archbishop of Canterbury.

The coronation took place with unwonted splendour and magnificence on the 19th of July. The queen resolved to be present, or to make a scene by seeking admittance in the eyes of the people. It is said that the more prudent of her friends endeavoured to dissuade her ; but it is to be apprehended that most of those who surrounded her, and who were making use of her merely for party or factious purposes, without any regard to the shock her feelings might sustain, strongly urged her to go down to the abbey. She went, and stopping before the abbey-door, was there refused admittance by the door-keepers and military officers on guard. She then wandered round the abbey walls in a vain search of some other entrance ; and having thus exhibited her humiliation, she retired through the dense multitude, applauded by some, but hissed and hooted and called foul names by others. It has been concluded that this was her death-blow ; but for many months she had been living in a state of excitement sufficient to kill a younger and stronger

woman. She expired at Brandenburgh House on the 7th of August; having directed that her only epitaph should be—"Here lies Caroline of Brunswick, the injured Queen of England." Blood was shed almost over her coffin. Ministers had ordered that the funeral procession, which was to proceed from Brandenburgh House towards Harwich (where the body was to be embarked for Brandenburgh), should make a circuit, in order to avoid passing through the populous parts of London, where some rioting was to be feared. On arriving at Kensington the procession, finding every road but that leading through London blocked up or barricaded by the mob, was obliged to take part of the forbidden route, intending, however, to get into the high north road by passing through Hyde Park. The park-gate by Apsley House was found closed and barricaded, but it was soon forced open by the military; and, followed by a rabble, the funeral procession moved up to the Cumberland gate of the park. This upper gate was also barricaded, and the mob seemed to be determined to prevent its being opened, for they stood in a dense mass behind their barricade, and some of them threw stones and pieces of brickbat at the soldiery. A conflict ensued, in which two of the mob were shot dead on the spot,—one by a common soldier, and one by an officer of the guards. The gate being at length forced open, the procession would have moved along the Edgware Road, and would have soon reached the quiet open country; but the mob renewed the conflict with a very unusual show of resoluteness: their shouts and shrieks were terrific; and, to prevent bloodshed, the directing civil magistrate, Sir Richard Birnie, after consulting with some of the military, gave orders that the mob should have their own way. The corpse was then borne right through London, and no very serious mischief happened. But the government forthwith dismissed Sir Richard Birnie, and also deprived that distinguished officer Sir Robert Wilson of his commission in the army for having remonstrated with some soldiers and an officer on duty. Sir Robert's *disgrace* or deprivation continued until the *accession of William IV.* A public subscription was

raised to compensate him for the pecuniary part of his loss.

The storm was now over: with the departure of the mortal relics of Caroline of Brunswick from Harwich there fell a dead calm upon the country. The king was at this time in Ireland. The news of the queen's death reached him as he was sailing to that country. Notwithstanding the recent passages in his history, the Irish people received the sovereign with an enthusiastic if not a delirious joy. His majesty remained in Ireland until the 5th of September; he arrived in London on the 16th, and left England for Hanover on the 24th of September. He made his public entry into the capital of his ancestors on the 11th of October. The Hanoverians were delighted with the royal visit.

Before this time two or three new revolutions had been attempted in Italy, and the Neapolitan revolution had been put down by Austrian arms. Early in the year portions of the King of Sardinia's army had revolted at Turin and Genoa, and had proclaimed a constitution; and essays of the same sort had been made at Milan, Modena, Parma, and elsewhere, though in these places they can scarcely be said to have got to the length of revolution, there being few troops in them except the troops of the Emperor of Austria, and it being altogether a hopeless task to attempt to constitutionalize, in Italy, Austrians, Hungarians, Bohemians, and Croats. Nearly simultaneously a small Austrian army marched into Piedmont, to restore the old order of things there, and a large Austrian army, at one time 50,000 strong, marched upon Naples. General William Pepe, the hero of the Neapolitan revolution, but a vain, vapouring, incompetent man, essayed to stop the march of the thoroughly disciplined Austrians with his undisciplined, badly-armed militia, and his spiritless, badly-officered troops of the line. In the month of March he fought a battle, or rather a skirmish, at Rieti, on the frontiers of the Roman States. The affair did not last an hour. Such of the militia as had not decamped before the battle broke and fled as soon as it had fairly commenced, and the regular

troops in a very brief space of time did as the militia. Except at the pass of Antrodoco, where a Colonel Rossi and a small body of cavalry made a very gallant stand, no real resistance was offered by the Neapolitans after the affair at Rieti. The formidable position of Mignano, bristling all over with artillery, was evacuated without the firing of a gun; the royal guards struck down the constitutional banner at Capua, trampled it under foot, and raised the flag of old Ferdinand in its stead; the strong Capua threw open her gates, the river Volturno, like the Garigliano, having been left defenceless; and, without the necessity of burning another ounce of powder, or of drawing a sword from its sheath, the troops of the Kaiser pursued their promenade upon Naples. Then in that city there was a great flight of patriots, poets, and pamphleteers, who had all vowed that they would die for liberty, and who had very fruitlessly exhorted their countrymen in arms to do the same thing; then there was a sudden shutting-up of clubs and a burning of Carbonari diplomas and records; then there was a magically rapid disappearance of mustachios (for every tailor and shoemaker of the city, belonging to the constitutional national guard, had previously let the hair of his face grow, and had been bearded like the pard—it being generally considered on the Continent that there is a close connection between constitutions and whiskers, liberal opinions and long mustachios); and then, too, some few of the Carbonari of Naples dyed their hands in the blood of a countryman. Gianpietro had been at the head of the police before the revolution, and had in that capacity created to himself some vindictive personal enemies: his reputation among the liberal party had always been exceedingly bad, and he enjoyed no very good name either among the moderate party or among the ultra-royalists. Driven from office, he had retired to a villa on the hill of Posilippo, just above the suburb of Mergellina, and was there living when the Austrians were coming on unopposed to the city. His enemies thought that, if they *missed the present opportunity*, and if the Austrians took *possession of the capital*, they would not only be barred

from their revenge, but have the mortification and the peril of seeing Gianpietro again restored to power. About a score of them dragged him from his house at midnight to the sea-shore at Mergellina, and they there dispatched him with more than a score of sabre and dagger wounds. This was the one solitary act of assassination committed in that populous capital by the Carbonari; and it was committed by a few, and not in their hour of success and triumph, but in the hour of their despair.

Midnight arrests, by hundreds a-night, flight, confiscation, ruin of families, whippings of Carbonari in the streets, closely followed the entrance of the Austrians and the return of King Ferdinand. The national debt, which had been all but extinguished, was increased to a fearful amount; and for five long years the Neapolitans had to pay and support an Austrian army varying from 50,000 to 30,000 men, every man of whom was liberally allowed double pay by the emperor out of the exchequer of his old protégé and ally. Above forty of the conspirators of Monte Forte, as the beginners of the so styled glorious revolution, were condemned to death, but only two—Morelli and Silvati—were executed. The others, however, were subjected to a horrible transportation and imprisonment in the barren islands of Ponza, Ventotena, &c.

At Milan, Pavia, Venice, and at nearly every town in Lombardy subject to Austria; at Turin, Genoa, Alessandria, and other parts of Piedmont; at Parma, Piacenza, Modena; at Rome, Bologna, Ancona, and other cities appertaining to the Pope, numerous arrests were made; and, collectively, many thousands of people, all belonging to the higher or middle classes of society, were suddenly involved in poverty and ruin. The Emperor of Austria would shed no blood on the scaffold; but the dungeons of Olmutz and Spielberg, the ponderous chains, the abominable diet, the stripes and blows to which he consigned his victims, were crueler *than death!* After these sad failures in constitutionalism, *doubt, suspicion, dismay and terror* were spread through *all the large towns of the Italian peninsula.* We s

towns, because, in truth, the revolutionary spirit never caught the country or rural districts, and because the Italian peasantry, forming the great mass of the population, never understood or cared for constitutions or for liberalism, but remained steadily attached to their church, and (if not always very heartily attached) submissive and respectful to their several governments. The easy, somewhat indolent government of King Ferdinand, receiving its momentum from Austria, became all at once active, restless, and excessively umbrageous. There was a terrible spy-system, a rigid, ridiculous, yet most vexatious system of passports; one could no longer go ten miles from the capital without obstructions from police and gendarmes: now, indeed, there was tyranny at Naples.

A.D. 1822.—Considerable distress was felt among landlords and farmers. Owing to the accelerated return to cash payments, which the government had insisted upon, the value of money rose, and the prices of agricultural produce fell still lower. There had been great county meetings, and many petitions had been presented to government, praying for some relief to the agricultural distress. To increase their strength, ministers opened the doors of office to the Grenville-Wynne party. Lord Grenville retired from public life, and the Marquess of Buckingham, as chief of the party and leader of the landholders, was created a duke. Mr. Charles Wynne was made president of the board of control. At this time Lord Sidmouth also retired, and was succeeded in the home department by Mr. Peel. This latter change proved of inestimable benefit to government and the country. Lord Wellesley, who entertained very liberal principles, was appointed lord-lieutenant of Ireland in the place of Lord Talbot.

The king opened the session of parliament on the 5th of February. His speech dwelt upon the distresses of the landed interest, and upon a new spirit of riot and outrage in Ireland; and his majesty recommended parliament to consider of the best means to restore order and law in that country. The Marquess of Londonderry

(Castlereagh), who had succeeded to this title upon the death of his father, introduced two bills for re-establishing the Insurrection Act, and the suspension of the Habeas Corpus Act in Ireland. Both were passed without difficulty.

Lord Wellesley had the satisfaction of soon seeing an end put to the Irish outrages; but he could not count on the seasons, and a dreadful famine came on, produced by the failure of the harvest, and especially of the potato crop. The southern and western counties suffered most. The Government hastened to abate these horrors, sending over 500,000*l.* to be placed at the disposal of Lord Wellesley, and to be dispensed by him in charitable relief or in public works. Private benevolence came to the aid of national generosity: great subscriptions were raised in England and Scotland, and wherever there was an English colony or settlement, or any place where a few Englishmen were congregated, some money was raised for the suffering people of Munster and Connaught.

It was conceived that Mr. Canning, by his conduct in the matter of the unfortunate queen, had given more offence to the king. The fact may be doubted. Mr. Canning was now appointed to succeed the Marquess of Hastings as Governor-General of India. As an exciting and noble leave-taking of the House of Commons, the illustrious orator, on the 30th of April, moved for leave to bring in a bill which should restore to Catholic peers their right of sitting and voting in the House of Lords. He had spoken so frequently on the Catholic question that it seemed difficult for him to introduce any fresh matter or novel illustration; but the genius of Canning was never so bright as now; and genius can make old things new, and give fresh, vivid, and startling illustrations to that which is trite. Mr. Canning most happily referred to the imposing ceremonies of the recent coronation:—

“ Did it occur to the representatives of Europe, who were contemplating this animating spectacle,—did it occur

the ambassadors of Catholic Austria, of Catholic France, or of states more bigoted in matters of religion,—that the moment this ceremony was over the Duke of Norfolk would become disseised of the exercise of his privileges among his fellow peers? That his robes of ceremony were to be laid aside and hung up, until the distant (be it a very distant!) day when the coronation of a successor to his present most gracious sovereign might again call him forth to assist at a similar solemnization?—that, after being thus exhibited to the eyes of the peers and people of England, and to the representatives of the princes and nations of the world, the Duke of Norfolk—highest in rank among the peers—the Lord Clifford, and others like him, representing a long line of illustrious ancestry, as if called forth and furnished for the occasion, like the lustres and banners that flamed and glittered in the scene, were to be, like them, thrown by as useless and trumpery formalities?—that they might bend the knee and kiss the hand; that they might bear the train or rear the canopy, might discharge the offices assigned by Roman pride to their barbarian ancestors—

“Purpurea tollant aulæa Britanni :”

but that, with the pageantry of the hour, their importance faded away; that as their distinction vanished their humiliation returned; and that he who headed the procession of peers to-day could not sit among them as their equal on the morrow!”

Mr. Canning was strongly opposed by Mr. Peel, who professed himself unable to discover any valid reason for exempting Roman Catholic peers from political restrictions to which a whole community, professing the same religion, were subject by law. Mr. Charles Wetherell was against partial concessions to the Catholics: if this bill passed, Catholic commoners would naturally expect to be admitted into parliament next year, and without restrictions: he would rather deal with the measure of emancipation *in toto*, than in this mutilated form. Mr. Canning's bill passed the Commons by a small majority of five voices, but it was thrown out by the Lords.

Early in the session Mr. Brougham moved that the landed interest should be relieved by an extensive reduction of taxes. This motion, being opposed by ministers, was negatived. On the 18th of February Lord Londonderry procured the appointment of the agricultural committee; and, on the 29th of April, in pursuance of a report of this committee, his lordship proposed a plan of relief—the repeal of the annual malt-tax, and a loan of a million by exchequer-bills to the landed interest, upon the security of warehoused corn. This scheme of relief was ultimately agreed to. The chancellor of the exchequer (Vansittart) produced some financial schemes, which were not very successful, and which were afterwards re-modelled; but in the course of the session an important reduction of taxes, exceeding 3,000,000*l.*, was effected.

The king in person prorogued parliament on the 6th of August, and on the 10th he embarked at Greenwich for Scotland. As his majesty was sailing from England to Ireland he had received the news of the death of his wife; and now, as he was sailing from England to Scotland, he received intelligence of a death which affected him much more—the deplorable suicide of Lord Londonderry. This high-spirited and, in private life, most amiable nobleman had been over-wrought and over-excited. For some time his health and good spirits had been declining. This had been noticed by all his friends, and by the king himself. With unaffected, real concern his majesty had implored the minister to have recourse to proper medical advice and treatment, and to give his over-tasked brain some rest from labour. At an early period of his life, long before he became involved in the turmoil of politics, and when he was serving as a subaltern officer in the army in Ireland, his lordship had betrayed symptoms of temporary aberration of intellect.* Private causes of annoyance—which would scarcely have vexed him if his health had

* For a curious story, see the ‘Life and Letters of Sir Walter Scott, by John Lockhart.’ But there are other stories told of Lord Castlereagh at this period of his life, which would show that his temperament and imagination were very excitable.

not been deranged—troubled his rest and sleep; and a real or imaginary terror, regarding himself only in his private capacity, or as an English gentleman, had for some time past been harrowing up his whole soul. To a few confidential friends he spoke with dread and unutterable disgust of mysterious meetings or waylayings in the streets; and he believed that the worst, the foulest, the most damnable secret conspiracy had been entered into against him. By those confidential friends it was believed that it was this dread, this frightful vision, that drove him to death. To talk, as his enemies did, of political remorse of conscience, and of his unwillingness to meet the absolute sovereigns of Europe at the Congress at Verona because his country would not allow him to abet the views of those monarchs and of the so-called Holy Alliance, is a malicious, monstrous absurdity. Lord Londonderry was satisfied with what he had done and with what he had to do; he knew himself to be disinterested, pure, *poor*; his conscience told him that whatever he had done he had done for the best, and for the good of his country; and, leaving a large margin for his occasional errors, and for his short fits of jealousy and ill-temper, we entertain precisely the same opinion of his ministerial conduct. Recent revelations, and scraps published from his diplomatic correspondence and state papers, had given the lie direct to his persevering enemies, and have proved how different was his conduct at the congress of Vienna, and how different his bearing towards the potentates and ministers of unconstitutional Europe, from that which they had been represented. His calumniators had never read those papers, although many of them were accessible. The wondering, gaping public has learned only recently that at Vienna Lord Castlereagh was the champion of Polish independence. The best monument to his lordship's fame, the best means of uprooting for ever the inveterate prejudices, misrepresentations, and falsifications of faction, would be the complete publication of his lordship's letters, despatches, and state papers, accompanied by explanatory notes, and a short interwoven text, giving a brief, condensed account of the transactions to

which they refer, of the personages engaged in them, and of the insurmountable obstacles which stood in his lordship's way. The noble house of Londonderry cannot be uninterested in the fame of their great relative, and they can scarcely perform a more honourable or a more useful task than that of placing among the materials of British history the sort of work to which we have alluded.

As the king left London for Scotland, the Marquess of Londonderry withdrew, in a very excited state, to his pleasant villa at North Cray, in Kent, and there, on the 12th of August, he destroyed himself by cutting the carotid artery with a sixpenny penknife, which he had bought for the purpose a day or two before. Thus lamentably perished, in the 54th year of his age, an honest and fearless minister, one of the handsomest and most elegant of men, whether of his own or of any other time—the most amiable and attaching of men in private life—the warmest and at the same time the steadiest of friends. A shameless rabble rout, with their heads muddled and turned by gin and radical newspapers, set up a demoniacal yell as his lordship's coffin was removed from the hearse to be conveyed into the interior of Westminster Abbey. But let not this un-English display rest upon us as a national reproach; it was but the deed of a few ruffians and drunkards, and the universal disgust expressed at it cleared the national character.

The death of Lord Londonderry rendered necessary a re-modelling of the cabinet. The place of leader in the House of Commons was left vacant, and must be filled. Who could presume to fill it while Mr. Canning was in life, and yet in England? Prejudices and objections were removed, all obstacles were levelled by the necessity of the times, and Mr. Canning, relinquishing his splendid India appointment, took the high office of secretary for foreign affairs.

The Duke of Wellington consented to fill Lord Londonderry's place at the Congress of Verona, and *repaired to Italy* early in October. Mr. Canning, as *secretary*, may have somewhat modified the foreign policy

of Lord Londonderry, and may have entertained the earnest wish of restricting despotism and of encouraging constitutional principles on the Continent; but the time had not come for action, England was not disposed to bully when she could not act; the liberal party on the Continent generally—all pupils of the French school, violent, anarchic—had little real claim on the sympathies of Englishmen; and the Duke of Wellington acted at Verona precisely as Lord Londonderry would have done if he had lived to be there: he protested against conduct and views which he considered wrong or excessive, he refused the countenance of his government to the hostile projects entertained by Russia, Austria, Prussia, and France against the Spanish constitutionalists, and he recommended to those sovereigns circumspection and moderation in other quarters. Up to this point there had been, and there could have been, very little change effected by Mr. Canning, who had been for so very short a time in office. The bolder tone in foreign policy was adopted at a later period. Now, peace was to be preserved, and no stronger measure resorted to than that of an occasional protest. Lord Londonderry had been equally prepared for protests, and neither more nor less anxious for the preservation of peace. A certain party who had been eternally clamouring for peace when war was necessary, would have now rushed into war when a continuance of peace was indispensable; and in such a war as they contemplated England would have had no other ally than a disorganised band of revolutionists, Carbonari, and other secret-society men and anarchists. As if to precipitate a war of this kind, an amount of insult was heaped upon the heads of the Continental sovereigns which has perhaps never been surpassed. Their system and procedure had in many instances been most censurable; but the liberals ought to have come in for a share of the blame; and if these intemperate, and, in good part, unprincipled, reformers had been enabled to establish a system of their own, Europe would not have been benefited by it.

On the question of a possible interference in the af-

fairs of Spain, Mr. Canning was very decided ; though even here he did not contemplate any resort to war. He wrote to the Duke of Wellington :—

“ If there be a determined project to interfere by force, or by menace, in the present struggle in Spain, so convinced are his majesty’s government of the uselessness and danger of any such interference, so objectionable does it appear to them in principle, as well as utterly impracticable in execution, that when the necessity arises, or (I would rather say) when the opportunity offers, I am to instruct your grace at once frankly and peremptorily to declare, that to any such interference, come what may, his majesty will not be a party.”

Strong opinions were expressed in the Congress of Verona as to the origin and tendency of the Spanish revolution, which was considered as the proximate cause of all the other revolutions of the years 1820 and 1821, with the single exception of the rising of the Greeks against their Ottoman masters. It was urged by the sovereigns and ministers of Russia, Austria, Prussia, and France, that no governments would be safe if military revolt were to be sanctioned ; that civil political reforms were begun with a bad grace by the soldiery ; that if some check were not put to secret societies the whole of Europe would be disorganized ; that the liberals of Spain were exercising far more cruelty and oppression than had ever been known under the unconstitutional government of Ferdinand VII. ; that the example set by these revolutionists must produce disastrous effects in other countries, and that their excesses would be fatal to their own country, ending in anarchy and carnage, which no man could contemplate without horror, and of which none could calculate the possible or probable duration. France, as bordering upon Spain, and as containing within her own bosom the ready elements of discord and civil war, considered herself most immediately interested in this question. She advanced many arguments in justification of an interference by force of arms ; but she did not openly *declare, at the Congress of Verona, that she was determined to attempt such interference.*

As to the re-settlement of Italy, which had been completely effected before the Congress of Verona assembled, England had little to say and nothing to do. Yet was it made evident to all in that congress that the British government and people would have beheld with satisfaction a settlement of that beautiful peninsula made upon less despotic principles.

The affairs of Greece, which will come under notice hereafter, were submitted to much discussion; but the congress then ended without adopting any very positive resolutions on that head. The Greeks were left to continue their struggle for independence, and no remonstrance was offered to the Turkish government on the dreadful cruelties exercised by some of its armies against a Christian people. In truth, that Christian people had betrayed a spirit quite as cruel as that of the Mohammedans. Some serious apprehensions had been entertained of a war between the Tzar and the Sultan, for the Russians were co-religionists of the Greeks; they had lent a selfish assistance to the Greeks in their former insurrections; and ever since the days of the Empress Catherine they had counted upon the Greeks as powerful instruments for opening their own way to Constantinople. This war between Russia and Turkey was prevented for the present by the deliberations at Verona; and this in reality was the one great act of that great congress, which left other things to run their natural course, and which advanced no new principle nor proposed any new arrangement whatsoever. The style of compliment adopted in this congregation of sovereigns bordered in some instances upon the ridiculous. The old Bourbon, Ferdinand of Naples, though he had his good qualities, and no small share of humour and untrained sagacity—was notoriously the least educated and the most thoughtless, indolent, and ignorant king in all Europe; but, as he chanced to be the oldest of the kings that met at Verona, they called him the Nestor of that royal congress. Upon the whole the grand assemblage may be said to have been a rapid unmeaning affair. The wordy and flowery Cha-

teaubriand, who was present as a French negotiator, has turned it into a book and into a romance.

A.D. 1823.—At the beginning of the year Mr. Canning was strengthened by the accession to office of two of his friends. Mr. Frederick Robinson became Chancellor of the Exchequer, in the room of Mr. Vansittart, who became Lord Bexley and Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster, retaining a seat in the Cabinet; Mr. Huskisson was appointed President of the Board of Trade, without a seat in the Cabinet. The latter of the two appointments was considered as a pledge that government intended to make some important advance towards free trade. The session of Parliament was opened by commission on the 4th of February. Earl Stanhope proposed an amendment to the address, recommending an immediate return to paper-currency as the best means of relieving the still-existing agricultural distress. This amendment being rejected by 62 to 3, the ministerial address was carried unanimously. The same unanimity, undisturbed by any proposal of amendment, prevailed in the Commons. The speech had clearly set forth that his majesty declined being a party to any proceedings at Verona, with a view to interference in the internal concerns of Spain by foreign powers; and that his majesty would use his utmost endeavours and good offices to avert the calamities of war between Spain and France. This was assuredly the wisest tone to adopt, and the safest course to pursue. England could not have made herself the ally of the Spanish liberals, who were engaged in a doubtful civil war, and who were undoubtedly the minority of the nation. But our parliamentary opposition had from the first maintained the cry that our king and government, in their aversion to liberal principles, were disposed to favour the Spanish absolutists, and to wink at any armed intervention attempted by the other sovereigns. Mr. Brougham now delivered a speech of wonderful eloquence, reprobating the so-called *Holy Alliance*, and advocating the cause and justifying the conduct of the Spanish revolutionists. On one grand

point the orator was entirely right—it would be better for Spain, it would be better for all Europe, to leave the Spaniards to settle their own quarrel by themselves.

Mr. Canning, having vacated his seat, was not yet re-seated. Considering the duties imposed by the representation of Liverpool incompatible with the occupation of his time as a minister, he took his seat for Harwich on the 12th of February. The distress of the landed interest was discussed incidentally on the 14th; and upon a motion by Mr. Whitmore for reducing the import price of grain, on the 25th of February, the motion was negatived, but there was an obvious disposition on the part of the government to open the trade in corn. The Foreign Trade Committee was at the same time re-appointed, and further steps taken to liberate foreign commerce. On the 21st of February the new chancellor of the exchequer made a favourable statement of the finances. The income exceeded the expenditure by 7,000,000*l.*, of which 5,000,000*l.* would be applied to the payment of the debt, and the remaining 2,000,000*l.* to a further remission of taxation.

During the session, debates took place on the Catholic claims, and were chiefly remarkable on account of a violent personal collision between Mr. Brougham, Mr. Canning, Mr. Peel, and other ministers who had been favourable to Catholic Emancipation, and who had taken office without stipulating that it should be made a cabinet question. Mr. Canning was now accused of insincerity and truckling.

On the 21st of May Sir James Mackintosh moved nine resolutions for mitigations of the excessive severity of our criminal law. They were resisted by Mr. Peel, and were negatived; but Mr. Peel forthwith brought in and carried four valuable bills, having the same tendency as the scheme of Sir James Mackintosh, but not going quite so far.

On the 14th of April Lord Liverpool and Mr. Canning, in their respective places, communicated to parliament the *diplomatic correspondence* which had taken place about the affairs of Spain. These papers exhibited

a good deal of insincerity and duplicity on the part of France, who was now marching an army across the Pyrenees to put down the constitution of 1820, and to re-pristinate the absolute government of Ferdinand VII. So long as it had been deemed necessary to use deceptive language, the French cabinet had used it. A French army had been stationed on the Spanish frontier almost ever since the first outbreak at Cadiz in 1820. When asked what this army meant, the French cabinet had replied that it was a "Cordon Sanitaire," and that its presence was rendered necessary to preserve France from the yellow fever which had broken out in Spain. The reply was not very satisfactory, for the yellow fever, or whatever epidemic disease it was which visited that part of the Mediterranean in the year 1822, was confined to the narrow limits of Barcelona, and to a few other places far removed from the French frontier. But Louis XVIII. himself declared that those were "evil-minded calumniators" who propagated the report that he intended an invasion of Spain; and his minister, M. Villèle, assured Mr. Canning that his intentions were pacific. Yet, in the beginning of this year, 1823, the French king informed his chambers that the pretended Sanatory Cordon was in reality an army of invasion, and that he had given the command of it to his illustrious kinsman the Duke of Angoulême, who was then on the point of leading it across the Pyrenees. M. Villèle, however, now assured Mr. Canning that the object of that French army of invasion was wholly disinterested and pacific; that it was going on a healing, holy, peace-making mission; that it would check cruelty and excess wherever they existed, but that it would on no account interfere between the insurgent bands of the Faith, as the ultra-royalists denominated themselves, and the constitutional government. And yet, a very short time after making these declarations, M. Villèle openly avowed to the French Chambers that he had found it necessary *to equivocate* with England, and to give fair promises, *until the army of invasion should be fully prepared to march.* He hoped, however, that the chambers would

not be censorious of his conduct, seeing that he had lost no time, and that while he had been amusing England he had been fomenting and aiding in Spain insurrections against the government which had risen out of the revolution of 1820.

It was but too evident that the members of the Holy Alliance went hand in hand with France. On the 5th of January Russia, Austria, and Prussia had recalled their ambassadors from Madrid, and other extreme measures had been resorted to by these sovereigns and by nearly all the minor potentates on the Continent, to show to the world the abhorrence in which they held the Spanish revolution and the liberal party. At the same time great dinners and public entertainments were given by the Whig party in London to the Spanish ambassador, his suite, and a number of Spanish liberals, who had come over to England with extravagant hopes that we would send fleets and armies to their succour. The public feeling throughout England was violently excited; but the public judgment, when cool, was in favour of peace. Mr. Canning could only choose between neutrality and war; and he most wisely and fortunately chose neutrality. It was soon made manifest upon what a hollow, rotten reed we should have rested if we had relied upon the Spanish liberals as allies and co-belligerents. Mr. Canning stated the grounds of his choice in the House of Commons with rare eloquence, logic, and perspicuity; and the course pursued by the foreign secretary was sanctioned by large majorities of both Houses. In the month of May Mr. Peel's Currency Bill of 1819 came into operation; but the Bank, finding itself sufficiently provided with gold, had pretty fully anticipated the period of commencing specie payments. In the same month the House of Commons unanimously passed a resolution to the effect that it was expedient to adopt measures for ameliorating the condition of the slave population of the colonies, with a view to their ultimate entire emancipation. The session was prorogued by commission on the 19th of June.

There had not been wanting lamentations that England had been obliged to truckle to France because she could

not go to war. The foreign secretary thus met these Jeremiads: "Our ultimate object was," said Mr. Canning, "the peace of the world; but let it not be said that we cultivate peace either because we fear, or because we are unprepared for, war; on the contrary, if eight months ago the government did not hesitate to proclaim that the country was prepared for war, if war should unfortunately be necessary, every month of peace that has since passed has but made us so much the more capable of exertion. The resources created by peace are means of war. In cherishing those resources we but accumulate those means; our present repose is no more a proof of inability to act, than the state of inertness and inactivity in which I have seen those mighty masses that float in the waters above your town is a proof they are devoid of strength, and incapable of being fitted for action. You well know, gentlemen, how soon one of those stupendous masses, now reposing on their shadows in perfect stillness—how soon, upon any call of patriotism or of necessity, it would assume the likeness of an animated being, instinct with life and motion; how soon it would ruffle, as it were, its swelling plumage; how quickly it would put forth all its beauty and its bravery, collect its scattered elements of strength, and awaken its dormant thunder. Such as is one of these magnificent machines when springing from inaction into a display of its might, such is England herself; while apparently passive and motionless, she silently concentrates the power to be put forth on an adequate occasion."

This was a portion of a speech with which Mr. Canning electrified the people of Plymouth in the course of an autumnal excursion which he made through some of the manufacturing and maritime districts, and in the course of which he greatly increased his popularity.

The Spanish liberals stood nowhere; they scarcely made a better fight than the poor Neapolitans had done. So soon as the heads of the French columns were seen *in the passes of the Pyrenees*, the bands of the Faith *became strong enough to scatter any constitutional force that could be brought against them.* Horrible reprisals *were committed; the soldiers threw down their liberty*

cockades and deserted in thousands to the banner of King Ferdinand, massacring such of their officers as attempted to retain or restrain them. On the 24th of May the French entered Madrid; on the 2nd of June a counter-revolution was effected at Lisbon by the military headed by Dom Miguel, second son of the king, who was hereupon re-established, against his will, in absolute power.

Ridiculous efforts were made in England by private individuals to support the Spanish liberals by subscriptions of money, and by sending out volunteers to fight for them against the French. In their enthusiasm, some British officers of rank, who ought to have known how utterly hopeless was the struggle, and how useless were their services, hastened to the Peninsula to be wounded in battles or skirmishes where the Spaniards ran away, and to be insulted and maltreated by the very Spaniards whom they went to assist. In a miserable fight before Coruña, which had once witnessed a nobler conflict, Sir Robert Wilson and Colonel Light were wounded. The Cortes, who had carried King Ferdinand along with them to Cadiz, and who there, and previously at Madrid, had done all that men could well do to insult and exasperate that prince, yielded to their fears, liberated him, and sent him out of Cadiz to join the Duke of Angoulême and the French army on the 1st of October; and on the 3rd of that month, after a most spiritless resistance, they surrendered Cadiz, "the cradle" of Spanish liberty and constitutionalism. Thus, in five months, without meeting any valid resistance, the French had overrun the country from the Pyrenees to the Straits of Gibraltar. Their progress had been facilitated by the clergy, the monks, and the common people, and by the treachery of Generals Abisbal, Morillo, and Ballasteros. As was to be expected, the first use Ferdinand made of his liberty was to issue a proclamation annulling all the acts of the constitutional government since March 1820. On the 7th of November *General Riego*, the William Pece of Spain, or that Neapolitan's prototype, was hanged on a gibbet of extraordinary height: he had been cruelly treated

during his imprisonment. Part of the French army was withdrawn from the Peninsula in the course of the year ; but 40,000 men of it were left to keep possession of the fortresses, and to guard against reaction.

France would gladly have interfered in the struggle carrying on in South America between the Spanish government and the insurgent colonies ; but here England met her with a firm negative. " We will not," said Mr. Canning, " interfere with Spain in any attempt which *she* may make to reconquer *what were once her colonies* ; but we will not permit any third power to attack or reconquer them for her."

A.D. 1824.—The year opened at home most auspiciously. Trade and manufactures were flourishing, and even the landowners and farmers had pretty well ceased to complain. The removal had been gradual, but since the peace of 1815 twenty millions of taxes had been repealed. This increased the incomes of individuals and the means of industrial activity. The public prosperity was evidenced in the vast increase of domestic comfort, in the abundance of capital, and in the consequent low rate of interest. The Bank of England reduced its rate of interest on advances, and other great companies followed the example. In this rapid falling of interest in the money-market, capitalists were induced to seek foreign investments which promised a higher per-centage. There was scarcely a state in the Old or the New World for which loans were not raised on our Stock Exchange. Ten, fifteen, twenty, twenty-five per cent., without good security, was preferred to the humble three and a half or four per cent. with the infallible security of the British government and the national faith. In the prosperity of this year was prepared the panic of 1825.

Parliament was opened by commission on the 3rd of February ; and the opening speech congratulated the United Kingdom on the prosperity it was enjoying, and on the state of public affairs at home and abroad. The Marquess of Lansdowne deplored the fate of Spain, and *censured the British cabinet for not remonstrating with more energy, and for not advancing more rapidly towards a recognition of the independence of South America.*

In the Commons Mr. Brougham went over the same and some more ground, censuring the Austrians in Italy as much as Ferdinand and the French in Spain; but in the midst of these censures the orator expressed more strongly and pointedly than had ever been done the belief that the amount of our national debt must preclude us from war. "England," said he, "stands bound over in recognizances of eight hundred millions to keep the peace." This expression, which could have been uttered only by a man of genius, sunk deep in the public mind, and was often quoted in bar of the foreign policy which Mr. Brougham and his party continued to recommend. If that policy had been pursued war would have become inevitable, or England must have sunk to the degraded character of a bully—to a protest-uttering machine—to an encourager of insurrection and revolution abroad, but devoid of the means or intention of supporting her friends and disciples. The opposite policy of Mr. Canning was sanctioned by large majorities.

The new chancellor of the exchequer announced that the public revenue continued to improve. Further steps were taken towards the free-trade system. The protecting duties between Ireland and Britain were repealed; the laws respecting the silk-trade were altered; and the absolute prohibition on foreign manufactured silks was removed, and a considerable blow thus struck at smuggling. Commercial treaties were entered into with the Netherlands, Prussia, and Sweden. It was agreed that the four per cents. should be reduced to three and a half. Injudicious bounties, which had never done any good, were removed. It had been a reproach to the British government for many ages that so little had been done for the encouragement either of literature or of the fine arts. In a trading country everything had been left to be done upon the commercial principle, or by private effort and private munificence. Ministers would not see—and they will not yet see—that the commercial principle is altogether inapplicable to the production of many of the *highest* intellectual things which *a nation requires*. In the course of this session, how-

ever, the sum of 57,000*l.* was voted to the purchase of Mr. Angerstein's collection of pictures for the public, to serve as the foundation of a national gallery.

The renewal of the Alien Bill was resisted by Sir James Mackintosh and others. The powers granted by the bill seemed, however, necessary at a time when England was becoming the refuge of half the fiery spirits of the Continent, and the bill was renewed: yet were its powers exercised in only one single case, and that case had no relation to politics. The refugees from Italy and Spain were treated with especial kindness and hospitality by government as well as by the people: but for public and private charity many thousands of them must have starved in the streets of London. Pity is it that more of them did not, during their long residence in England, learn more moderation and political wisdom than they have since shown! Seven years of exile and proscription would have been more than compensated for if the men who have since revolutionized and ruled in Spain had learned the real workings of a constitutional form of government, and the means by which a people is fitted for such government.

The offence of engaging in the slave-trade was now declared piracy, subject to be punished with death. A dangerous spirit of insubordination manifested itself amongst the negroes in our West Indian colonies, arising out of the mistaken idea that parliament had decreed their emancipation, and that the colonial houses of assembly were opposed to the execution of the measure. The session of parliament was closed by the king in person on the 25th of June.

Much as the intervention of the French in the affairs of Spain had been abused, it was indisputably owing to the presence of their troops that the mad vindictive fury of the royalists was restrained, and that any tranquillity was enjoyed in the country. By a third convention, concluded in the month of December, the number of the French Army of Occupation was reduced to 22,000 men. *No period was fixed for the duration of this occupation. An insane attempt made by Valdez and some other*

constitutionalists upon Tarifa ended in court-martials, extensive shootings, and imprisonments.

The Dey of Algiers had been at least as unable, as he had been unwilling, to put a stop to piracy and Christian slavery. He involved himself in a quarrel with the British consul, who was constantly remonstrating with him; and when an Algerine ship was examined and captured for having seventeen Spanish slaves on board of her, war was declared against the Algerines. On the 24th of July Sir H. Neill, our admiral in the Mediterranean, appeared off Algiers, with twenty-two ships of war, bombs, &c. The heart of the Dey failed him; he implored to be allowed to negotiate; and he forthwith bound himself very solemnly to observe and cause to be observed every clause of the treaty which his predecessor had concluded with Lord Exmouth in 1816.

There was a new war on a grand scale in India, which was proceeding with a good prospect of ultimate success; and there was a war on a very small scale on the coast of Africa, which was attended by disastrous circumstances. Being much troubled by the plundering and warlike Ashantees, Sir Charles Macarthy, the governor of Cape Coast Castle, prepared to march up the country against them. The barbarian king summoned all his vassal states to his standard, calling on them to arm against the English "the very fishes of the sea;" and he sent a message to tell Sir Charles that if he moved on he would flay off his skin and make a war-drum of it. Sir Charles did move; and it is said that the fierce African did by him what he had threatened. On the 21st of January the governor—a very corpulent man, who had acted with remarkable want of military judgment—and the small force with him, were surrounded in a hollow near the bank of a river by 10,000 Ashantees. Sir Charles received a mortal wound in the breast from a musket-ball; and there was a terrible slaughter of officers and men. A hasty retreat was made upon Cape Coast Castle. *On the 21st of May Major Chisholm gained a victory over a great Ashantee army, but not*

until the barbarians had fought with great spirit for five hours. The king now died ; but his brother who succeeded him was not less inveterate in his hostility to the English. He sent a message to Colonel Sutherland, who now held the command, importing that " If the walls of Cape Coast Castle were not high enough, the colonel ought to build them higher ; and that if they were not sufficiently furnished with cannon, he ought to land those belonging to the ships of war ; but that all he could do would not prevent the king from throwing the whole into the sea." Notwithstanding various threatening movements, the Ashantees did not venture upon an attack. After burning and destroying all the villages near Cape Coast Castle, they withdrew a short distance into the interior. On the 4th of July a few fresh troops arrived from England ; and on the 11th another fierce and long battle was fought. The Ashantees, who showed 16,000 fighting men on the field, suffered a terrible loss, and many of their greatest chiefs were killed or wounded. They very faintly renewed the combat on the 12th ; but on the 20th they withdrew altogether.

Louis XVIII. of France died on the 16th of August in this year, and was succeeded by his brother, the Count d'Artois, under the name of Charles X. The first act of the reign of this unfortunate prince was of a popular character—it was an act of grace towards the anarchists, who, five years afterwards, drove him from his throne and from his country for ever. He published a decree declaring that he did not judge it necessary to maintain any longer the measure which had been adopted under different circumstances against the abuses of the liberty of the press ; and that he, therefore, by the advice of his council, ordained that " the ordonnance of the 15th of August last, which enforced anew the laws of the 31st of March, 1820, and the 26th of July, 1821, should cease to have effect." And thus the censorship of the newspaper press ceased once more in France. M. de Villèle was continued in power, and no material alteration was made in his cabinet. A very large portion of the press called Charles X. " the noble son of

France, the model of honour and loyalty, the best prince that could have been called to reign over a loyal people."

A.D. 1825.—Parliament was opened by commission on the 3rd of February. The speech reviewed more circumstantially than usual the state of public affairs, foreign and domestic. Russia was still eager to fall upon Turkey, whose strength seemed almost exhausted by the war in insurgent Greece; but differences were arranged, or the plea in justification of war taken out of the hands of the Russians, by the firm and able British ambassador, Mr. Stratford Canning, cousin to the secretary for foreign affairs. Thus peace seemed no longer in danger in the East. Commercial relations with the now really free states of South America had been confirmed by formal treaties; consular agents had been appointed to those states, and there was a prospect that when war should entirely cease they would afford a grand field to our commerce. That commerce had been benefited, not injured, by the abolition of restrictive laws and prohibitory duties. "There never," said the speech, "was a period in British history when the people were so thriving and contented." Industry and commercial enterprise were said to be extending themselves even in Ireland. But then his majesty had to lament, "that associations should exist in Ireland, which have adopted proceedings irreconcilable with the spirit of the constitution, and calculated, by exciting alarm, and by exasperating animosities, to endanger the peace of society and to retard the course of national improvement." These words applied to the Catholic Association, which was raising large sums of money by subscription, and pursuing other strong courses, with a standing declaration that they would never cease agitating the country until all the Catholic claims were conceded. Mr. Brougham argued that the Orange societies, which fostered Protestant intolerance, ought to be put down as well as the Catholic Association. Except on this one topic, there was no dissent to the addresses in either House. In the Lords, Viscount *Dudley and Ward*, who moved the Address, dwelt with

infinite eloquence on the reigning prosperity—"a prosperity extending to all orders, all professions, and all districts, enhanced and invigorated by the flourishing state of all those arts which ministered to human comfort, and by those inventions by which man seemed to have obtained a mastery over Nature by the application of her own powers; and which, if any one had ventured to foretell it only a few years ago, would have appeared altogether incredible, but which, now realized, though not yet perfected, presented to us fresh prospects, and a more astonishing career." In the same exultant tone, his lordship alluded to the New World:—"That world which had been first opened to us by the genius of a great man, but afterwards closed for centuries by the barbarous and absurd policy of Spain, was, as it were, re-discovered in our days. The last remnant of that veil which concealed it from the observation and intercourse of mankind had just been torn away; and we saw it abounding, not only in those metals which first allured the avarice of greedy adventurers, but in those more precious productions which sustain life and animate industry, thus cheering the mind of the philosopher and statesman with boundless possibilities of reciprocal advantage in civilization and commerce."

Not foreseeing how soon the popular contentment would be overclouded, Lord Dudley and Ward revelled in its existence. "He remembered that a great historian and statesman, after describing what appeared to him (and what according to the imperfect nature of those times undoubtedly was) a period of great prosperity, still complained that there was wanting what he called a proper sense and acknowledgment of those blessings. That, of the want of which Lord Clarendon had once complained, was not wanting to us now: the people of England felt and acknowledged their happiness: the public contentment was upon a level with the public prosperity." Alluding to the benefits which had arisen from the removal of commercial restrictions, he recommended that the principle should be persevered in. In every case in which the principle had been acted upon,

the effects had been highly beneficial. When the bill for the removal of the restrictions on the silk trade was brought forward, how numerous and weighty were the complaints which were made! Yet, so far from the trade having decayed, as had been anticipated, it had flourished since that period more rapidly than before, and had since extended almost as fast as the cotton manufacture had done. We no longer dreaded the rivalry of the foreigner in our market, and were able to contend with him in the markets on the Continent. We were now fully taught that the great commercial prosperity of England had not arisen from our commercial restrictions, but had grown up in spite of them.

After stating his conviction that the concession of the claims of the Catholics was essential to the tranquillity of Ireland, he expressed his mortification at seeing much in the language and conduct of the Roman Catholics themselves which was calculated to keep alive the remembrance of old times; to fix upon their church the charge of being *semper eadem* in its most odious sense; and to strengthen the arguments and embitter the feelings of those who were determined, at all hazards, to resist their claims. Their language had become menacing, and their conduct trod upon the utmost verge of the law; provoking the hostility of their enemies, and terrifying their friends. They had already lost all those that wavered; and they might ere long shake those that were still firm. It was only by reverting to another line of conduct, that they could justify the cordial co-operation of their friends, or conciliate opponents, too strong to be overcome except by the entire subversion of the state itself. They should keep in mind that this is no country for rapid changes—that even our liberties were of slow growth. If they would but compare their own condition with what it was forty years ago, they would see ample reason to be content with the past, and sanguine as to the future. There were now living many who had grown up to manhood before the claims of the Catholics in their actual extent had ever been heard of, and before any statesman would have ventured to espouse them,

had they been advanced. While he thus disapproved of the conduct of the Irish Catholics, he entreated the House not to be diverted by a just indignation at their extravagant proceedings, from the permanent state of the question. It would probably be the duty of that House to concur in some measure to curb their licentious spirit ; but that done, their lordships ought to consider anxiously whether the state of the Catholics was one that could continue ; and whether, if the admission of the Catholics to the stations from which they were excluded were an evil, it was not a less evil than their discontent in good times, and their possible disaffection in bad ones. Continuing his truly great speech, Lord Dudley and Ward demonstrated that England could make herself the ally neither of the absolute sovereigns of the Continent nor of the Liberals ; and that, in the present condition and temper of Europe, neutrality was not only the most prudent but the best, the justest, and most noble attitude she could assume. “ The real contest which existed in Europe was not between governments, but parties. There were two great parties, neither of them loving England ; one desiring to restore the ancient order of things, and the other constantly striving after some new order. The former were not contented with that order which existed before the French Revolution, but wanted something more despotic. They did not like our form of government, and naturally looked on our free institutions as a pregnant source of principles which they always dreaded, and wished to repress. The other party, calling themselves Liberals, were desirous of destroying every thing which existed ; and the only remedy they could find for all the evils of mankind was, to sweep away every institution which was ancient and which had been held in veneration. They were, while they boasted of their attachment to freedom, extremely narrow and illiberal ; and however they might differ among themselves, they were all actuated by a bitter hatred towards this country. They were not sincere in their love of *liberty*, of which they talked so much ; for they had *crouched before Bonaparte*, and worshipped him, and

had endeavoured to reduce England to an imperial province. They were the enemies of all the principles of national liberty, of national independence; and the institutions of this country they above all things abhorred. *They resembled their predecessors, the Jacobins, but had less sincerity.* It was only when they were subdued by their opponents that they called out loudly for liberty, by which they meant power. They were now bitterly complaining that this country had not aided them; had not done that which would have proved its own serious injury, if not its own destruction."

In the recent recognition of the South American states, Lord Dudley and Ward contended that we had proceeded with the utmost caution, justice, and delicacy. "It was a difficult question to decide where insurrection ended and new legal government began. His majesty's government had not pretended to determine where allegiance ought to end and lawful resistance begin; but had acted openly upon the undisputed fact of those states of South America, with which treaties had been concluded, being actually independent."

This was one of the magnificent public displays by which this highly gifted and still much lamented nobleman established his reputation as an accomplished orator and great statesman. Alas! that so bright an intellect should have been clouded, destroyed by disease!

The recognition of their independence, although it could not long allay their internal dissensions, was of immense advantage to the South American states; and if there had been more honesty on their part and more caution on ours, the immediate benefit to England herself must have been great. Mr. Canning took pride in being the author of the recognition. He was in a manner the parent of South American independence. "I called that New World into existence," said he, "to redress the balance of the Old."

On the 10th of February, Mr. Goulburn, now Irish secretary, brought in a bill "to amend the Acts relating to unlawful societies in Ireland." The debate lasted *through four nights*, and was very stormy: yet it was

mostly remarkable for a speech delivered by Mr. Canning in answer to those who had been incessantly charging him with lukewarmness or insincerity in the cause of Catholic emancipation. In a very affecting manner, he went over his whole political life, showing that in every period of it he had been eager for concessions and for an enlarged toleration. "I have shown," said he, "that in the year 1812 I refused office rather than enter into an administration pledged against the Catholic question. I did this at a time when office would have been dearer to me than at any other period of my political life,—when I would have given ten years of life for two years of office; not for any sordid or selfish purpose of aggrandizement, but for far other and higher views. But is this the only sacrifice I have made to the Catholic cause? From the earliest dawn of my public life, aye, from the first visions of youthful ambition, that ambition has been directed to one object above all others. Before that object, all others vanished into comparative insignificance: it was desirable to me beyond all the blandishments of power, beyond all the rewards and favours of the Crown. That object was, to represent in this House the university in which I was educated. I had a fair chance of accomplishing this object when the Catholic question crossed my way. I was warned, fairly and kindly warned, that my adoption of that cause would blast my prospect: I adhered to the Catholic cause, and forfeited all my long cherished hopes and expectations. And yet I am told that I have made no sacrifice! that I have postponed the cause of the Catholics to views and interests of my own! The representation of the university has fallen into worthier hands. I rejoice with my right honourable friend near me (Mr. Peel) in the high honour which he has obtained: long may he enjoy the distinction; and long may he prove a source of reciprocal pride to our parent university and to himself! Never till this hour have I stated, either in public or in private, the extent of *this irretrievable sacrifice*; but I have not felt it the less *deeply*. It is past, and I shall speak no more of it." Mr.

Goulburn's motion was carried by 278 against 123 ; and the bill being passed by both Houses received the royal assent on the 9th of March. Thus an end was put to the Catholic Association, but it soon revived under another name.

Sir Francis Burdett moved and carried through the House by small majorities, a three-fold plan—the repeal of Catholic disabilities ; the enactment of a state-provision for the Catholic clergy ; and the raising the Irish 40s. to a 10l. franchise. The Lords threw this scheme out of their House. It was during the debates there that the Duke of York, presumptive heir to the Crown, made his well-remembered declaration, that he would to the last moment of his life, and in whatever situation he might be, resist the emancipation of the Catholics, “ So help him God.”

Mr. Robinson, the chancellor of the exchequer, who was now acquiring the name of Prosperity Robinson, delivered a very sanguine speech on the present state and future prospects of finance and trade. He could congratulate the House and the country that the surplus revenue had exceeded his calculation and expectation by nearly 100,000l. ; and he reduced taxes to the amount of a million and a half. The session was closed by commission on the 6th of July.

Parliament had scarcely risen ere all their bright prospect was overcast. A money-panic, which seems generally to be the wildest of all panics, spread over the country at a pace not much slower than that of the electric fluid which runs along Mr. Wheatstone's telegraphs. The joint-stock mania of 1824, and of the first months of 1825 ; the general intoxicated spirit of commercial enterprise ; the immense amount of capital forced into various branches of foreign trade or speculation,—into gold mines, Mexican and Columbian loans, pearl fisheries, &c., &c,—from which it could not be called in, and where, in many cases, there remained but the slenderest chance that any interest would ever be paid upon it ; an unfavourable turn in the exchanges, and other of those *mysterious twists in the money-market* which are understood only by stock-jobbers, and not always by them, all

co-operated to produce money-difficulties, and a panic greater than any that had been seen since the year of the bursting of the South Sea bubble. The failure of three or four great London banks produced a general crash of the country bankers; and the autumn of 1825 was a veritable crisis—a period of wide-spreading distress and ruin, and of timidity and suspicion which made the ruin and distress spread the farther. It was apprehended that cash-payments would be restricted by an Order in Council: but ministers conceived that trade and credit might be relieved by less extensive measures; and they made only a temporary issue of 1*l.* and 2*l.* bank notes, and an extraordinary issue of sovereigns from the Mint.

The war in India still continued; but it was evident before the close of the year that it would soon be ended advantageously.

The Emperor Alexander of Russia, who had been visiting Poland and traversing nearly the whole breadth of his empire, died at Taganrock on the Black Sea, on the 1st of December. He was only in his 48th year, and until recently had appeared to be in the enjoyment of a robust state of health. By the Russians he will ever be considered as a great and good monarch; and Europe ought not to forget how much her liberation from Bonaparte and the French was owing to the steadiness of Alexander in 1812. He left no son to succeed him. The Archduke Constantine, the eldest of his brothers, had contracted an imprudent marriage with a Polish lady, had showed a want of prudence in other matters, and had voluntarily renounced his right of inheritance. A conspiracy, in which Constantine had no share, and the success of which would in all probability have been fatal to him and to all his house, was easily defeated, and the Grand Duke Nicholas—the Emperor now reigning—was left quietly to succeed to the empire.

A.D. 1826.—The distress at home, though much moderated, was still severe. When parliament was opened by commission on the 2nd of February the *speech* turned chiefly upon the money crisis. “His *majesty*,” said the speech, “relies upon your wisdom to *devise such measures as may tend to protect both public*

and private interests against the like sudden and violent fluctuations, by placing on a firm foundation the currency and circulating credit of the country." Those who still clung to paper-money augured from these words that government had no intention of returning to it. In the House of Peers Lord King moved an amendment to the address, pledging ministers to a revision of the corn laws within the session. This was negatived without a division. In the Commons Mr. Brougham vindicated the recently adopted principles of free trade from any share in producing existing difficulties. It would not have been quite so easy to show that the recognition of South American independence had not had a large share in producing those difficulties. But then there was the consolation that a vast continent had been thrown open to commerce, and the natural hope that time would restore those states to tranquillity, enable them to pay their debts, and to give a tenfold wider range to their trade. Only those who well knew the character and habits of the Spanish-descended Americans, shook their heads and doubted whether a long republican anarchy would not follow the subversion of the old institutions.

The chancellor of the exchequer submitted a proposition for putting an end to the circulation of all bank notes under the value of 5*l.*; and this was adopted by 232 against 89. This great majority decided both the particular question and the general principle. Some salutary alterations were then made in the system of country banks. There was a very loud clamour; but government was firm in its determination of not returning to small notes. It guaranteed the Bank of England to the extent of 200,000*l.* in the purchase of exchequer bills in the money-market; and the Bank offered to lend 300,000*l.* upon security, direct or collateral. The loans actually applied for fell far short of the disposable fund. In some trading towns no applications were made. The knowledge that such loans were attainable restored commercial confidence.*

Many and violent were the attacks made by the dia-

* *Wallace, 'Life and Reign of George IV.'*

ciples of the old school of finance and anti-free trade party upon Mr. Huskisson, who was universally considered as the principal author of the recent changes. Mr. Canning stood eloquently forth for the defence of his friend and colleague. "Is it not," said he, "the same doctrine and spirit which now animate those who persecute my right honourable friend; is it not the very same which in former times stirred up persecution against the best benefactors of mankind? Is it not the same doctrine and spirit which embittered the life of Turgot? Is it not a doctrine and a spirit such as this which consigned Galileo to the dungeons of the Inquisition? Is it not a doctrine and a spirit such as this which have at all times been at work to stay public advancement, and to roll back the tide of civilization? A doctrine and a spirit actuating the minds of little men, who, incapable of reaching the heights from which an extended view of human nature can be taken, console and revenge themselves by calumniating and misrepresenting those who have toiled to those heights for the advantage of mankind. Sir, I have not to learn that there is a faction in the country—I mean not a political faction—I should, perhaps, rather have said a sect, small in numbers and powerless in might, who think that all advances towards improvement are retrogradations towards jacobinism. These persons seem to imagine that, under no possible circumstances can an honest man endeavour to keep his country upon a line with the progress of political knowledge, and to adopt its course to the varying circumstances of the world. Such an attempt is branded as an indication of mischievous intentions, as evidence of a design to sap the foundations of the greatness of the country."

Mr. Huskisson had been reminded of the commercial policy of the great and patriotic Mr. Pitt (whose notions on free trade had really gone many leagues further than the opponents of free trade dreamed of), and they had *even reproached* Mr. Canning with having departed from *the principles* of his early friend and political master. *To these objections Mr. Canning now replied:—"It is*

singular to remark how ready some people are to admire in a great man the exception rather than the rule of his conduct. Such perverse worship is like the idolatry of barbarous nations who can see the noonday splendour of the sun without emotion ; but who, when he is in eclipse, come forward with hymns and cymbals to adore him. Thus, there are those who venerate Mr. Pitt less in the brightness of his meridian glory than under his partial obscurations ; and who gaze on him with the fondest admiration when he has accidentally ceased to shine."

The tables of both Houses were loaded with petitions from the manufacturing districts chiefly, praying for an alteration in the Corn Laws. A motion was made and rejected for a general inquiry into the operation of those laws. In the month of May Mr. Canning introduced two measures, one for the admission of bonded corn upon payment of a certain duty ; the other for allowing ministers the power of admitting foreign grain at their discretion during the recess. Both were carried after strong opposition ; but, in the second bill, the quantity of corn admissible was limited to 500,000 quarters, and the period of admission to two months from the opening of the ports.

Notwithstanding the recent distress, the state of the finances was still favourable, the income exceeding the expenditure by half a million : trade was reviving everywhere.

In the course of this session Mr. Peel introduced and carried some valuable reforms in the criminal law of the country. The parliament, which had had six sessions, was prorogued by commission on the 31st of May, and was dissolved on the 2nd of June. The chief questions which candidates had to answer at the hustings related to the Corn Laws and the Catholic claims—questions upon which the great mass of the nation was still much divided.

Towards the end of August the price of grain rose above the point at which importation was allowed ; but the averages *could not* be taken and foreign corn legally

admitted until the 15th of November. The markets must be supplied. Ministers, acting on their responsibility, admitted foreign corn by an Order in Council on the 1st of September.

Parliament assembled prematurely on the 14th of November ; but this haste was owing less to the necessity of a bill of indemnity for ministers, than to the unhappy condition of our ancient ally Portugal, who needed and had called for our immediate assistance.

The counter-revolution at Lisbon which so closely followed the entrance of the French into Madrid has been mentioned. The leader of that movement was Dom Miguel, second son of King John VI. He was aided by his mother, a princess of violent passions, whose religious feelings were wounded by the disrespect shown by the constitutionalists to the church, and by the confiscations and alienations the liberals had precipitated upon monastic and church property. He was vigorously supported by the clergy, monks, and peasantry of Portugal. Dom Miguel was accused of having formed a parricidal conspiracy against his father, a humane, weak, indolent, and not very able king, who would have resigned himself to the course of events, and have willingly submitted to the constitution and the Cortes, who, on their side, were not very wise, and who lacked the humanity and gentleness of their old sovereign. One of his majesty's chamberlains appears to have been assassinated ; his other servants were arrested, and the king himself was a prisoner until the British minister interfered and got him safely on board a British ship of war in the Tagus. In April, 1824, there was another revolution : Dom Miguel was sent out of the country, John VI. was reinstated, and quiet for the time was restored. The French minister at Lisbon had all along made common cause with Dom Miguel and the queen, labouring to destroy the old ascendancy of England in Portugal, and even attempting to occupy that country with French troops drawn from *the Duke of Angoulême's* army in Spain. But this last *design had been* foiled by the vigilance and determined

tone of the British government, and by the constant presence of a British fleet or strong squadron in the Tagus.

Brazil was virtually as free of the mother country, Portugal, as the Spanish states of South America were free of Spain ; but both the people and the court of Portugal hung back from a recognition of this independence, and the relations between them and the people and government of Brazil continued in a very unsettled state until May, 1825, when John VI., acting by the advice of Mr. Canning, and under the influence of England, acknowledged, by letters patent, the independence of Brazil, which had chosen his elder son Dom Pedro to be emperor, and which, as yet, had neither any hatred for the House of Braganza nor any passion for democratic institutions. John VI. died on the 10th of March of the present year (1826). He had appointed his daughter, the Infanta Isabella Maria, Regent of Portugal, in the name of his elder son Dom Pedro, then resident in Brazil. But the constitution of Brazil had provided that the two crowns should never be united on the head of one prince. Dom Pedro had therefore to choose between the two crowns. Preferring that of Brazil, he abdicated the Portuguese crown in favour of his eldest daughter Donna Maria da Gloria. Thus far Dom Pedro did that which he was entitled to do ; but we must continue to doubt his right of drawing up a constitution for the country the throne of which he had refused. He drew up and sent over with his act of abdication a constitution for the Portuguese nation ; and both acts were brought to Europe by our minister Sir Charles Stewart.

As the Portuguese liberals were in a weak and tottering condition, they received Dom Pedro's constitution with acclamations. The faction of the queen and Dom Miguel, still counselled and abetted by the French minister and by the ministers of other and absolute governments, heaped execrations upon it. The constitution itself was certainly open to many attacks. Dom Pedro had never been King of Portugal. Constitutions cut and dry were never worth anything ; constitutions did not

proceed from kings singly, and if they could so proceed, it were surely necessary that the sovereigns granting them should be established on the thrones of the countries to which they were granted. Such as it was, however, this new constitution, the manufacture of Brazil, was established on the 31st of July.

With a view to prevent a disputed succession and the horrors of civil war in his native country, Dom Pedro, in his act of abdication, had directed that his daughter should espouse her uncle Dom Miguel, and share the throne of Portugal with him. This compromise failed completely. The Miguelites, the partisans of the old order of things in church and state, could never coalesce with the liberals, who rallied round Donna Maria and the new constitution, and who were more than ever resolutely bent on innovation. If Dom Miguel had entered into the arrangement proposed he would have ceased to have a party—he would from that moment have been nothing. He was rather carried on by the torrent that had broken its floodgates already, than the man who let that torrent loose, or that gave it its direction. He was patted on the back by the representatives of the unconstitutional sovereigns, and French gold is said to have been circulated in various parts of the kingdom for the purpose of bringing about another revolution in his favour. Soon some Portuguese regiments flitted across the frontier into Spain, and there proclaimed and swore allegiance to Dom Miguel as king of Portugal. The Spanish government gave every aid to these deserters and to others who followed them. The British government joined the Portuguese regency in remonstrances to the court of Madrid. That court disavowed what had been done by its officers on the frontiers; but shelter, arms, ammunition, and equipments continued to be distributed from Spanish magazines to the Miguelites; and it was rumoured that a Spanish force was in preparation to co-operate with them, and that an invasion of Portugal was contemplated from *more points than one*. The Marquess of Palmella, Portuguese ambassador at London, applied to the British government for military assistance. This aid, under the

circumstances, could not be withheld, unless we broke our faith as allies, and tore up an express treaty which clearly provided that such assistance should be given. On the 11th of December Lord Bathurst in the Upper, and Mr. Canning in the Lower House, brought down a message from the king, reciting the faithless and hostile proceedings of the Spanish government, and calling upon parliament to support him in maintaining the faith of treaties towards Portugal, his oldest ally. "His majesty," said the message, "leaves no effort unexhausted to awaken the Spanish government to the dangerous consequences of this apparent connivance." The eloquence of Mr. Canning was never more remarkable than on this occasion. He said that there could be no hesitation in saying that assistance was due by us to Portugal, supposing the occasion for her demanding it had arisen. "In our opinion it had. Bands of Portuguese rebels, armed, equipped, and trained in Spain, had now recrossed the frontier, carrying terror and devastation into their own country, and proclaiming sometimes the uncle of the reigning sovereign of Portugal, sometimes a Spanish princess, and sometimes even Ferdinand of Spain as the rightful occupant of the Portuguese throne. These rebels had crossed the frontier, not at one point only, but at several points; and it was remarkable that the aggression on which the original application to Great Britain for succour was founded, is not the aggression with reference to which that application has been complied with. The attack announced by the French newspapers was on the north of Portugal, in the province of *Tras os Montes*, an official account of which has been received by his majesty's government only this day. But on Friday last an account was received of an invasion in the south of Portugal, and of the capture of *Villa Vici-oça*, a town lying on the road from the southern frontier to Lisbon. This new fact established even more satisfactorily than a mere confirmation of the attack first complained of would have done, the systematic nature of the aggression from Spain against Portugal. One hostile irruption might have been made by some single

corps escaping from their quarters, by some body of stragglers who might have evaded the vigilance of Spanish authorities, and one such accidental and unconnected act of violence might not have been conclusive evidence of cognizance and design on the part of those authorities; but when a series of attacks are made along the whole line of a frontier, it is difficult to deny that such multiplied instances of hostility are evidence of concerted aggression. If a single company of Spanish soldiers had crossed the frontier in hostile array, there could not be a doubt as to the character of that invasion. Shall bodies of men, armed, clothed, and regimented by Spain, carry fire and sword into the bosom of her unoffending neighbour; and shall it be pretended that no attack, no invasion has taken place, because, forsooth, these outrages are committed against Portugal by men to whom Portugal had given birth and nurture? What petty quibbling it would be to say that an invasion of Portugal from Spain was not a Spanish invasion, because Spain did not employ her own troops, but hired mercenaries to effect her purpose! And what difference is it, except in aggravation, that the mercenaries in this instance are natives of Portugal? The vote for which I call is a vote for the defence of Portugal, not a vote for war against Spain. Unjustifiable as I shall show the conduct of Spain to have been—contrary to the law of nations and of good neighbourhood, of God and of man—still I do not mean to preclude a *locus pœnitentiæ*, a possibility of redress and reparation. It is our duty to fly to the defence of Portugal, be the assailant who he may. In thus fulfilling the stipulations of ancient treaties, of the existence and obligation of which all the world are aware, we, according to the universally-admitted construction of the law of nations, neither make war upon the assailant, nor give to that assailant, much less to any other power, just cause for war against ourselves.” He declared that he was neither the critic nor the champion of the Portuguese constitution. That it was not for us to force that constitution on the people of Portugal, if they were unwilling to receive it; that it was no business of ours to fight its

battles. "We go to Portugal in the discharge of a sacred obligation contracted under ancient and modern treaties. When there, nothing shall be done by us to enforce the establishment of the constitution; but we must take care that nothing shall be done by others to prevent it from being fairly carried into effect. Internally let the Portuguese settle their own affairs; but with respect to external force, while Great Britain has an arm to raise, it must be raised against the efforts of any power that shall attempt forcibly to control the choice, and fetter the independence, of Portugal. Has such been the intention of Spain? Whether the proceedings which have lately been practised or permitted in Spain were acts of a government exercising the usual power of prudence and foresight (without which a government is, for the good of the people who live under it, no government at all), or whether they were the acts of some secret illegitimate power, of some furious fanatical faction, overriding the councils of the ostensible government, defying it in the capital and disobeying it on the frontiers, I will not stop to inquire. It is indifferent to Portugal, smarting under her wrongs—it is indifferent to England, who is called upon to avenge them—whether the present state of things be the result of the intrigues of a faction over which, if the Spanish government has no control, it ought to assume one as soon as possible—or of local authorities over whom it has control, and for whose acts it must therefore be held responsible. It matters not, I say, from which of these sources the evil has arisen: in either case Portugal must be protected, and from England that protection is due. . . . There are reasons which entirely satisfy my judgment that nothing short of a point of national faith or national honour would justify, at the present moment, any voluntary approximation to the possibility of war. Let me be understood, however, distinctly, as not meaning to say that I dread war in a good cause (and in no other may it be the lot of this country ever to engage!) from a distrust of the strength of the country to commence it, or of her resources to maintain it. I dread it, indeed, but upon far other grounds;

I dread it from an apprehension of the tremendous consequences which might arise from any hostilities in which we might now be engaged. Some years ago, in the discussion of the negotiations respecting the war against Spain, I stated that the position of this country in the present state of the world was one of neutrality, not only between contending nations, but between conflicting principles; and that it was by neutrality alone that we could maintain that balance, the preservation of which I believed to be essential to the welfare of mankind. I then said that I feared that the next war which should be kindled in Europe would be a war not so much of armies as of opinions. Not four years have elapsed, and behold my apprehensions realized! It is, to be sure, within narrow limits that this war of opinion is at present confined; but it is a war of opinion that Spain (whether as government or as nation) is now engaging against Portugal: it is a war which has commenced in hatred of the new institutions of Portugal! How long is it reasonable to expect that Portugal will abstain from retaliation?"

Becoming more and more impressive, Mr. Canning thus concluded his magnificent oration:—"If into that war this country shall be compelled to enter, we shall enter into it with a sincere and anxious desire to mitigate rather than to exasperate; and to mingle only in the conflict of arms, not in the more fatal conflict of opinion. But I much fear that this country (however earnestly she may endeavour to avoid it) could not, in such case, avoid seeing ranked under her banners all the restless and dissatisfied of any nation with which she might come in conflict. It is the contemplation of this new *power* in any future war which excites my most anxious apprehension. It is one thing to have a giant's strength, but it would be another to use it like a giant. The consciousness of such strength is undoubtedly a source of confidence and security; but, in the situation in which this country stands, our business is not to seek opportunities of displaying it, but to content ourselves with letting the professors of violent and exaggerated doctrines on both sides feel, that it is not their interest to convert an umpire into

an adversary. The situation of England amidst the struggle of political opinions which agitates more or less sensibly different countries of the world, may be compared to that of the ruler of the winds, as described by the poet—

———— Celsâ sedet Æolus arce,
Sceptra tenens ; mollitque animos, et temperat iras.
Ni faciat, maria ac terras cœlumque profundum
Quippe ferant rapidi secum, vertantque per auras.

“The consequence of letting loose the passions at present chained and confined, would be to produce a scene of desolation which no man can contemplate without horror ; and I should not sleep easy on my couch if I were conscious that I had contributed to precipitate it by a single moment. This is the reason—a reason very different from fear—the reverse of a consciousness of disability—why I dread the recurrence of hostilities in any part of Europe ; why I would bear much and forbear long ; why I would put up with almost anything that did not touch national faith and national honour, rather than let slip the furies of war, the leash of which we hold in our hand, not knowing whom they may reach, or how far their ravages may be carried. Such is the love of peace which the British government acknowledges ; and such the necessity for peace which the circumstances of the world inculcate. Let us fly to the aid of Portugal by whomsoever attacked, because it is our duty to do so ; and let us cease our interference where that duty ends. We go to Portugal not to rule, not to dictate, not to prescribe constitutions, but to defend and to preserve the independence of an ally. We go to plant the standard of England on the well-known heights of Lisbon. Where that standard is planted, foreign dominion shall not come.”

Mr. Canning sat down much exhausted, amid loud cheers from all sides of the house. No speech in parliament had ever produced more effect. Mr. Brougham was charmed into unqualified moderation ; and, in supporting the motion, declared, “that the burdens of the country, however oppressive, would be borne cheerfully

through the impending struggle, if war should be the result ; for now we were governed on wise, liberal, and truly English principles. He felt that with the strong and impregnable principles now acted on, we could cope with the world in arms. But we should not be put to that trial ; the knowledge that these principles were acted on would be a security against it. In these principles we have the strongest practical security against future danger. Our burthens may remain, but our government know that when the voice of the people is in their favour, they have a mighty lever, if not in their hands, within their grasp." Other members of opposition were as cordial as Mr. Brougham. Mr. Joseph Hume did indeed make one of his hard, dry speeches, complaining of the expense to which we must be put ; and moving an amendment, "that the House be called over this day week." But the House had no patience to listen to him ; and although the amendment was pressed to a division, only three or four voted for it. This proposed amendment, however, led to some further debate, and afforded Mr. Canning the opportunity of making a reply, which almost surpassed in eloquence his preceding speech. Sir Robert Wilson and Mr. Baring, though they supported the address, cast some censure on government for allowing France to interfere with the affairs of Spain and occupy that country with an army. Mr. Canning explained that when that French army entered Spain, we might indeed, if we had chosen, have visited that measure by a war ; but such a war would not, in those days, have been the proper method of restoring the balance of power. And we were not then bound to interfere on behalf of Spain, as we now are bound to interfere on behalf of Portugal, by the obligations of treaty. "It is a singular confusion of intellect which confounds two cases so precisely dissimilar. Far from objecting to the reference to 1823, I refer to that same occasion to show the consistency of the conduct of *myself and my colleagues*. We were then accused of *truckling to France*, from a pusillanimous dread of war. *We pleaded guilty to the charge of wishing to avoid*

war. We described its inexpediency, its inconveniences, and its dangers; but we declared that although we could not overlook those dangers, those inconveniences, and that inexpediency, in a case in which remote interest and doubtful policy were alone assigned as motives for war, we would cheerfully affront them all in a case, if it should arrive, where national faith or national honour were concerned. Well, then, a case has now arisen of which the essence is faith, of which the character is honour; and, when we call upon parliament, not for offensive war, which was proposed to us in 1823, but for defensive armament, we are referred to our abstinence in 1823, as disqualifying us for exertion at the present moment, and are told that, because we did not attack France on that occasion, we must not defend Portugal on this! I, sir, like the proposer of the amendment, place the two cases of 1823 and 1826 side by side, and deduce from them, when taken together, the exposition and justification of our general policy. I appeal from the warlike preparations of to-day to the forbearance of 1823, in proof of the pacific character of our councils—I appeal from the imputed tameness of 1823 to the message of to-night, in illustration of the nature of those motives by which a government, generally pacific, may nevertheless be justly roused into action. It has been suggested, sir, that we should at once ship off the Spanish refugees now in this country, for Spain, and that we should, by the repeal of the Foreign Enlistment Act, let loose into the contest all the ardent and irregular spirits of this country. Such expedients I disclaim. I dread and deprecate the employment of them. So far, indeed, as Spain herself is concerned, the employment of such means would be strictly, I might say epigrammatically, just. The Foreign Enlistment Act was passed in the year 1819, if not at the direct request, for the especial benefit of Spain. What right, then, would Spain have to complain if we should repeal it now for the especial benefit of Portugal? The Spanish refugees have been *harboured in this country*, it is true, but on *condition of abstaining from hostile expeditions against*

Spain ; and more than once, when such expeditions have been planned, the British government has interfered to suppress them. How is this tenderness for Spain rewarded ? Spain not only harbours and fosters and sustains, but arms, equips, and marshals the traitorous refugees of Portugal, and pours them by thousands into the bosom of Great Britain's nearest ally. So far then as Spain is concerned, the advice of those who would send forth against Spain such dreadful elements of strife and destruction, is, as I have admitted, not unjust. But I repeat, again and again, that I disclaim all such expedients ; and that I dread especially a war with Spain, because it is the war of all others in which, by the example and practice of Spain herself, such expedients are most likely to be adopted. Let us avoid that war if we can,—that is, if Spain will permit us to do so. But in any case let us endeavour to strip any war, if war we must have, of that most formidable and disastrous character the honourable and learned gentleman (Mr. Brougham) has so eloquently described, and which I was happy to hear him concur with me in deprecating, as the worst evil by which the world could be afflicted. . . . It would be disingenuous, indeed, not to admit that the entry of the French army into Spain was, in a certain sense, a disparagement, an affront to the pride, a blow to the feelings of England : and it can hardly be supposed that the government did not sympathize on that occasion with the feelings of the people. But I deny that, questionable or censurable as the act might be, it was one which necessarily called for our direct and hostile opposition. Was nothing then to be done ? Was there no other mode of resistance than by a direct attack upon France, or by a war to be undertaken on the soil of Spain. What, if the possession of Spain might be rendered harmless in rival hands—harmless as regarded us, and valueless to the possessors ? Might not compensation for disparagement, be *obtained*, and the policy of our ancestors vindicated, by *means better adapted to the present time* ? If France occupied Spain, was it necessary, in order to avoid the

consequences of that occupation, that we should blockade Cadiz? No. I looked another way—I sought materials of compensation in another hemisphere. Contemplating Spain, such as our ancestors had known her, I resolved that if France had Spain, it should not be Spain ‘with the Indies.’ I called the New World into existence to redress the balance of the Old. Once more I declare that the object of the address which I propose is not war: its object is to take the last chance of peace. If you do not go forth on this occasion to the aid of Portugal, Portugal will be trampled down, to your irretrievable disgrace; and then will come war in the train of national degradation. If, under circumstances like these, you wait till Spain has matured her secret machinations into open hostility, you will in a little while have the sort of war required by the pacificators: and who shall say where that war will end?”

On the same night in the Upper House a similar address was moved by Lord Bathurst, and seconded by Lord Holland. The Duke of Wellington spoke next, and was listened to with that attention which he merited while reasoning on such a subject. He expressed a hope that it would be permitted to him, who for many years had had the direction of the resources of both the countries which formed the subject of discussion against a common enemy, to lament that any necessity should have arisen for our interference between them. He also hoped that the measures which called for our interference were more to be attributed to the perfidious conduct of the servants of the King of Spain, to the captains-general of provinces, and to inferior ministers, than to his Catholic Majesty. Whether, however, they proceeded from the one or the other, he could not possibly see bodies of troops on both sides of the Douro, and on the south of the Tagus and the Guadiana at the same time, all armed by the Spanish authorities, without immediately perceiving that there must be a concurrence of the Spanish government. Under the circumstances, therefore, of this *preconcerted* invasion of the Portuguese territory, *he was of opinion* that the *casus fœderis* did

clearly exist, and that we were bound to send troops to the support of our ancient and faithful ally. War, however, might still be prevented; and he hoped for the assistance of France in preventing the breaking out of hostilities, in bringing the King of Spain to a just sense of his own danger, to a proper feeling of what was due both to his dignity and his interest, and to the obligations of good faith. The address was carried through the Lords without one dissentient voice.

The country was quite as unanimous as parliament on this decisive measure. "The reasons on which it was founded," says a writer of the day, "and the promptitude with which it had been adopted, inspired confidence; the ardour, the manliness, the deep tone of generous feeling with which it had been defended, excited esteem and admiration. Never were a government and its subjects in more complete unison. The activity of the public officers kept pace with the wishes of both: an armament, consisting of 5000 men, under the command of Sir William Clinton, was equipped in an almost incredibly short space of time. Even the winds of heaven seemed to favour the enterprise. Mr. Canning pronounced his speech in the House of Commons on the 12th of December, and on Christmas-day the ship which carried the first detachment of the British army cast anchor in the waters of the Tagus."*

The illustrious foreign secretary had thrown poetry and a new life and soul into politics: he had elevated the tone of parliament; he had raised and elated the intellect and heart of the nation. Such eloquence as his had not been heard for many a long year; and the glowing generosity of his sentiments was a higher and finer thing than his eloquence. At the close of 1826 the popularity of George Canning seemed unbounded.

On the 13th of December parliament adjourned till the 8th of February.

Long before this, intelligence had arrived of the triumphant close of the Burmese war in the East.

The Burmese or *Burmans* had long been elated by

* Annual Register for 1826.

conquests easily made over their unwarlike neighbours. They had conquered Pegu; they had subdued Assam; they had reduced a congeries of small independent states, and they had conceited themselves into the belief that nothing in Asia could resist their arms. Not even in the East had conquest often been attended with such extermination and atrocious cruelty as had been practised by these semi-barbarians. Towards the end of the year 1823, their conquests having brought them into immediate contact with the frontiers of the British-Indian empire, they began to make sundry unprovoked attacks upon us. In a sudden night-attack, they drove away a small guard of British troops, and took possession of the small island of Chapuree. Our Indian government sent in a very gentle remonstrance, which the arrogant court of Ava considered as a pusillanimous attempt to deprecate the resentment of the warlike conquering Burmese. They triumphantly appealed to the paper as a proof that the British dreaded to enter upon a contest with them; and they intimated that unless their right to the island of Chapuree was distinctly admitted, the "Victorious Lord of the White Elephant and the Golden Foot" would invade the Company's dominions. In the meanwhile two companies of our 20th regiment landed on the disputed island, drove off the Burmese, and stockaded themselves. And on the other side the Burmese seized on the main land the commanding officer and some of the crew of the Company's cruizer 'Sophia,' loaded them with chains, and carried them up the country. War could no longer be avoided; but while we were preparing for it, from 4000 to 5000 Burmese and Assamese burst across the south-east frontier of Bengal, and claimed the province of Cachar as their own. At daybreak on the 17th of January, 1824, Major Newton attacked them in their stockades, gave them a terrible defeat, and drove them back to their hills. Major Newton had scarcely retired when they repeated their attack in greater force than before. They were defeated by Captain Johnstone on the 18th of February. On the following day Lieutenant-Colonel Bowen came up, and, taking the command over

Captain Johnstone, marched in pursuit of the retreating enemy. They were driven by the bayonet from some of their stockades ; but one of these works was so formidable, and the fire from within so well sustained, that five of our officers and about 100 of our sepoy were killed or wounded ; and Lieutenant-Colonel Bowen was obliged to call off the attacking party and retire to Chayrapoor at a short distance. On the 27th February (1824), Colonel Innes came up with four guns and a battalion of fresh troops, and assumed the command ; but in the meanwhile the Burmese had retreated from their formidable position, and retired into their own country.

But before this time the great Burmese chief, the Maha Bandoola, had collected a great army near the southern extremity of our frontier, and had marched into Aracan, provided with golden fetters in which the Governor-General of India was to be led captive to Ava. This Maha Bandoola had convinced his king that with 100,000 men the conquest of Bengal might be achieved. Therefore the Lord of the Golden Foot now laid claim to all the territories east of Moorshedabad, as having formerly belonged to the kingdom of Aracan, which he and his ancestors had conquered. His pride was soon subjected to a fall.

On the 10th of May, 1824, a British fleet and a land force of from 5000 to 6000 men arrived within the bar of the Rangoon river. The Burmese made a feeble ineffectual fire from some batteries and then fled. Our troops being landed took quiet possession of Rangoon ; but it was an utterly deserted town, from which everything had been removed except the miserable houses. Oxen, horses, boats, provisions, everything that was at all likely to be of use to an invading army, had, by order of the court of Ava, been previously carried far up the Irrawaddy river. This system hampered Sir Archibald Campbell's movements from the first ; and as it was steadily and effectually pursued afterwards, our advances *were slow*, and the war became a long one. The British *troops and sepoy* were compelled by the rainy monsoon *to take up a long residence* at Rangoon, situated in

the midst of unhealthy swamps and rice-grounds. A fearful mortality soon began. Many bold attempts were made by the Burmese to drive the invaders from the town. The river was covered with long and gilded war-boats, the warriors in which often fought desperately. A series, a perfect continuity of stockades was erected, and was gradually pushed nearer and nearer to Rangoon. Like the Cingalese, the Burmans rarely met an enemy in the open field : their conquests had all been made through the system of stockades. Instructed and trained from their youth in the formation and defence of these works, they had attained to great skill and judgment in the use of them. By making gradual approaches, and by carefully stockading all their positions as they advanced, their wars had for many years been an uninterrupted series of triumphs. When they were getting rather too near to Rangoon, Sir Archibald Campbell beat up their quarters. There was some very hard fighting before the stockades could be destroyed. On the last day of June all the woods in Sir Archibald's front again exhibited bustle and commotion ; 8000 men had crossed to the Rangoon side of the river ; the jungles around seemed full of life ; clouds of rising smoke marked the encampments of the different corps of the Burmese army in the forest, and their noisy preparation for attack formed a striking contrast to the still and quiet aspect of the British line.* The Shoo Dagon, or the Golden Dagon Pagoda, was the key of the British position. On the morning of the 1st of July the enemy, with their stockading materials, issued in dense masses to the right and front of the pagoda. They were very soon repulsed by two field-pieces served with grape and shrapnel, and by a brilliant charge of the 43rd Madras native infantry. On the 8th of July Sir Archibald Campbell advanced to Kemmendine, attacked a great army stockaded there, and inflicted upon them a terrible loss. The commander-in-chief, several chieftains of high rank, and 800 men were found lying dead

* *Major Snodgrass's 'Narrative of the Burmese War.'*

within the stockades ; and the neighbouring jungles were filled with the wounded.

A detachment under Colonel Miles subdued the maritime possessions of the Burmese to the eastward, in the hope that their loss might induce the court of Ava to sue for peace. Tavoy surrendered ; Mergui was taken by storm, and the people all along the coast of Tenasserim gladly placed themselves under British protection. But these achievements occupied time, and when the result was known at Ava it seemed to produce no effect on the determined temper of that court. The Lord of the Golden Foot, who had recalled all his unsuccessful commanders-in-chief who had not been slain in battle, now sent his own brothers, the Prince of Tongboo and the Prince of Sarrawaddy, with a whole host of astrologists and a corps of "Invulnerables," to join the army, to direct the future operations of the war, and to drive the English into the sea—or die. The astrologists were to fix the lucky moment for attacking: the Invulnerables had some points of resemblance to the Turkish Delhis ; they were the desperadoes or madmen of the army, and their madness was kept up by enormous doses of opium. The corps of Invulnerables consisted of several thousand men, divided into classes, the most select band of all being called the "King's Invulnerables." It was soon found that they were as susceptible of wounds and death as the astrologers were incapable of interpreting the stars. Upon the arrival of the two princes the Burmese resumed the offensive. They made a fierce attack upon the Golden Dagon Pagoda on the night of the 13th of August, but it was only to encounter defeat and a slaughter more terrible than they had ever yet sustained. The Invulnerables ventured no more near any of our posts. But a far more terrible enemy had gotten within our lines—the dysentery broke out among our troops, killing many of them, and reducing more to a most emaciated and feeble state. At one time scarcely 3000 *duty-soldiers* were left to guard our lines.

Giving up for the present the notion of conquering

Bengal, the great Maha Bandoola quitted the southern extremity of our frontier, and marched to the Irrawaddy to reinforce the army there. His own army was reinforced on its way down to the river. He began his march about the end of August, at a season of the year when none but Burmese could have kept the field for a week; and he reached Donoopew on the Irrawaddy before Sir Archibald knew that he had left Aracan. Happily our troops, though wofully reduced in numbers, were now fast recovering their health and strength, and two fresh British regiments, some battalions of native infantry, a regiment of cavalry, a troop of horse-artillery, and a troop of rockets, arrived from Calcutta and Madras, together with some admirable draught cattle: 500 native boatmen came round from Chittagong, and were busily employed in preparing boats for river service.

A small detached force under Lieutenant-Colonel Godwin sailed from Rangoon on the 13th of October to Martaban, once the splendid capital of the kingdom of Pegu. The Burmese were soon driven with loss from the town and from all their defences. The inhabitants of Martaban, being chiefly Talains or Peguers, received the British troops with every appearance of satisfaction and joy. Another frontier-fortress of the Burmese, called Yeh, next fell into our hands. In all this part of the country the native population were eager to be released from the iron sceptre of Ava, and to be included among the subjects of the British.

By the end of October the rains had entirely ceased at Rangoon. Sir Archibald Campbell was preparing to put his army in motion when Maha Bandoola came down to meet him at Kimmendine, with 60,000 fighting men, of whom 35,000 were musketeers, a considerable train of artillery, and a body of Cassay horse, the best cavalry of this part of Asia. It was thought best to wait for him. Our troops were thus spared much fatigue, and a great decisive battle might bring the court of Ava to reason. On the 1st of December the Maha Bandoola attacked both by *water and by land*. War-boats and rafts, filled *with combustible materials*, and favoured by wind and

current, were poured against our flotilla on the Irrawaddy ; but the skill and intrepidity of British seamen proved too much for the numbers and devices of the Burmese. Not one of our ships was injured. The fire-rafts exploded like mere fire-works ; our sailors clapping their hands at the pretty spectacle they afforded. On terra firma the Burmese were still less successful. They were driven from their stockades, were cut to pieces, or scattered to the winds by the gallant Major Sale (afterwards the hero of the Affghan war), and the no less gallant Major Walker, who unfortunately fell in the action, together with a good number of his brave comrades and men. This fighting lasted, in all, and at all points, through the 1st, 2nd, 3rd, 4th, and 5th, of December. On the 6th, Bandoola was employed in rallying his defeated troops. On the 7th he made his last and grand attack on the Shoo Dagon Pagoda. Here his troops were beaten again, driven back to their intrenchments, then driven out of them, and forced back into the jungle at the point of the bayonet. During these seven busy and fiery days the Burmese, in addition to a prodigious loss of lives, had lost every gun they had, and the entire materiel of their army.

On the 11th of February, 1825, the British began to move up the Irrawaddy. A few wretched families were found wandering in the woods, and looking like spectres from starvation and misery ; but, with the exception of these poor people, the country seemed to be left to the dominion of the tiger and wild hog. A mistake was committed by Sir Archibald in dividing his small force ; and Brigadier-General Willoughby Cotton commanding one of the divisions, and acting with very little judgment, failed in an attack upon the works of Donoopew. No fewer than 150 of our men were there killed or wounded ; and the retreat was so precipitate and so shamefully managed, that the wounded were not carried off, although it was well known that they would all be put to a cruel death. The next day most of our killed and wounded *men who had been left in the stockade were crucified and put upon rafts, which were sent floating down the*

river towards our flotilla. On the 25th of March Sir Archibald Campbell himself sat down before the truly formidable works of Donoopew, and commenced making regular approaches. On the 1st of April, after several sorties had been made and repulsed with loss, our mortar batteries and rockets began their work of destruction, and continued firing at intervals during the day and part of the succeeding night. The Burmese remained close under the protection of their works, making at first little, then less, and at last no return at all to our fire. "This excited much surprise, but on the next morning the mystery was explained. At daylight on the 2nd of April, just as our breaching-batteries began to open, two Lascars, who had been prisoners in the fort, came running out, and informed our people that the great Bandoola had been killed the day before by one of our shells or rockets; that after his death was known no entreaties of the other chiefs could prevail upon the Burmese to remain at their posts, and, in short, that the whole army had fled or dispersed during the dark hours of the night."* By possession of Donoopew, that magnificent river, the Irrawaddy, was entirely under our command, from its broad mouths on the ocean to the valley of Ava and Amarapoora, where it contracts and becomes unnavigable. On the 4th of April, two days after taking possession of Donoopew, our main army recommenced its march for Prome. On the 24th of April it came within sight of that city. On the next day the Burmese set fire to Prome and fled higher up the river. By the exertions of our troops a considerable part of the town was saved from destruction. The rainy monsoon now set in, and rendered necessary a suspension of operations. By order of the Golden Foot, fire was set to every town and village that was likely to be in or near to the British line of march; and horses, cattle, provisions, and all things were removed towards Ava. At the same time the court of Ava took most vigorous measures for recruiting the army, and for providing it with powder and weapons.

* *MacFarlane's 'Indian Empire.'*

A truce was agreed to, which was not observed by the Burmese, and a negotiation for a peace was entered upon by the court of Ava solely as a means of gaining time and lulling the British into a false and perilous security. At last the Burmese negotiated, and sent the following laconic epistle to Sir Archibald:—"If you wish for peace, you may go away; but if you ask either money or territory, no friendship can exist between us. This is Burmese custom." So soon as this letter was sent, the Burmese, who had collected all the force they could assemble, left a reserve of 10,000 men in a strongly fortified post at Melloon, and advanced against Sir Archibald with 60,000 men. Although he had received reinforcements, Sir Archibald, after providing a garrison for Prome, had a field force of not above 5000 men, but of these 3000 were British. In the first encounter the Burmese were successful, beating back two brigades of native Madras infantry, killing Colonel M'Dowall, the commander, wounding four of the junior officers, and killing or wounding a great many of the sepoy. But about a fortnight after this encounter, or on the 1st of December, the great Burmese army was most thoroughly discomfited; and those who rallied were beaten to pieces on the 2nd of December. Sir Archibald Campbell then proceeded to Melloon. On the 12th, while the army was on its march, the cholera broke out; and ere it could be checked, it carried off many men of the native Madras divisions, and rendered two British regiments almost unfit for duty. On the 26th of December, when our troops were within ten miles of Melloon, a flag of truce was sent to Sir Archibald Campbell from the last-named place, with letters communicating the arrival of a high commissioner from Ava with full powers to conclude a treaty of peace. This was another delusion; but time was granted in order to see whether the Burmese had been beaten enough, and were really sincere in their desire for peace. It was soon seen that they required *more beating*. On the 19th of January, 1826, when *two pieces* of artillery had opened the way for our *storming column*, the works of Melloon were stormed

and taken ; and from 10,000 to 15,000 Burmese were driven away in a confused and helpless mass from the strongest works they had ever erected. The beaten army, and all the beaten divisions and detachments of it, continued to retreat upon Ava with all possible speed. On the 25th of January Sir Archibald Campbell resumed his march over a barren country and execrable roads. On approaching Pagham-mew, a town about one hundred miles above Melloon, he obtained positive information that a levy of 40,000 men had been ordered, and that the people had been induced to enrol by means of a high bounty and several honourable privileges and distinctions ; that the Golden Foot had bestowed upon this new army the flattering appellation of " Retrievers of the King's Glory ;" and that this army had been placed under the command of a savage warrior styled Nee Woon-Breen, which has been variously translated as " Prince of Darkness," " King of Hell," and " Prince of the Setting Sun." Upon the 8th of February, when within a few days' march from Pagham-mew, Sir Archibald ascertained that the Retrievers of the King's Glory and the Prince of Darkness were prepared to meet him under the walls of that city. On the 9th the British column moved forward in order of attack, being much reduced by the absence of two brigades, and considerably under 2000 fighting men. The advanced guard was met in the jungle by strong bodies of skirmishers ; and, after maintaining a running fight for several miles, the column debouched into the open country, and there discovered the Burmese army, from 16,000 to 20,000 strong, drawn up in an inverted crescent, the wings of which threatened the little body of assailants on both their flanks. But Sir Archibald pushed boldly forward for their centre, threw the whole weight of his column upon that point, broke and shattered it in the twinkling of an eye, and left the unconnected wings severed from each other. The Retrievers of the King's Glory did not fight so well as those who had been accused of forfeiting his majesty's glory : *they all fled as fast as their legs could carry them to a second line of redoubts and stockades, close under*

the walls of Pagham-mew; but the British column followed them so closely that they had little time for rallying in those works; and so soon as a few English bayonets got within the stockades, all the Burmese went off, screaming like a scared flock of wild geese. Hundreds jumped into the river to escape their assailants, and perished in the water; and, with the exception of 2000 or 3000 men, the whole army dispersed upon the spot. The unfortunate "Prince of Darkness," or "King of Hell," or "Prince of the Setting Sun," fled to Ava; and he had no sooner reached the court than he was put to a cruel death by order of the king.* The court of Ava now gave in, and sent commissioners to treat honestly for a peace. Sir Archibald, however, continued his advance until he reached Yandaboo, only forty-five miles from the capital. Some prisoners, British subjects and others who had been residing up the country when the war broke out, and who had been treated with execrable barbarity, were now liberated, and were the principal negotiators for the Burmese sovereign. On the 24th of February, 1826, the treaty of peace was settled and finally signed at Yandaboo. By this treaty it was agreed that there should be perpetual peace and friendship between the honourable Company and his majesty the King of Ava; that the King of Ava should renounce all claims upon, and abstain from all future interference with, the principality of Assam and its dependencies, as also with the contiguous petty states of Cachar, Lynteen, and Munipoor; that his majesty should cede to the Company in perpetuity the conquered provinces of Aracan, including the four great divisions of Aracan, Ramree, Cheduba, and Sandoway; that the Aracan mountains should henceforward form the boundary between the two great nations on that side—that his majesty should also cede the conquered provinces of Yeh, Tavoy, Mergui, and Tenasserim, with the islands and dependencies thereunto appertaining, taking the Saluen River as the line of demarcation on that *frontier*—that his majesty, as part indemnification for the

* Charles MacFarlane, 'Our Indian Empire.'

expenses of the war, should pay the sum of one crore of rupees—that henceforth accredited British ministers, with a body-guard of fifty men, should be allowed to reside at Ava, and that an accredited Burmese minister should be sent to reside at Calcutta; and that free-trade should be allowed to British subjects in all the dominions of his majesty, who should abolish all exactions upon British ships entering his ports, &c.—and that “the good and faithful ally of the British government, his majesty the King of Siam, having taken a part in the present war,” should, to the fullest extent, as far as regards his majesty and his subjects, be included in the above treaty.*

The money demanded as part indemnification was far too moderate a sum. The king was rich, and both gold and silver bullion abounded in Ava. A crore of Sicca rupees at par were barely equivalent to 1,000,000*l.* sterling. The war had cost us from 7,000,000*l.* to 8,000,000*l.* With an easy liberality our commissioners waived all claims for indemnities or recomences for the cruel sufferings of our unfortunate prisoners, or for the losses they had sustained, not only in property but in health, by their long and torturing captivity; and although they stipulated in an article that private debts owing by Burmese to British subjects should be liquidated, they consented to consider a part of the property which had been seized by the king, at the time when he threw the Englishmen at Ava into prison, as *confiscated* by the laws of the country, and so removed out of the operation of any treaty of peace. In other respects the treaty was such as it should be. The cession of Aracan gave us an admirable mountain frontier, and amply provided for the freedom from Burmese interference with our Indian territories on that side. The possession of the Tenasserim provinces, and of the islands that lie off that coast, and off the coast of Aracan, gives increased security to our commercial navigation, opens the road to an inland commerce with the Siamese, Shans, and other distant people; places at our disposal teak-forests of enormous extent, and productive

* *C. MacFarlane, ‘Our Indian Empire.’*

of the very best timber. Moreover, a variety of valuable raw produce is procurable, or may be raised, from these new territories, to be replaced by the manufactures of India or of Great Britain. The whole country of Tenasserim is known to be rich in minerals; iron ore of good quality is found in abundance in the vicinity of Tavoy; and extensive coal-measures have been lately discovered in several places on the banks of the Tenasserim River. The discovery of these coal-measures must have an advantageous effect on the steam navigation of the Gulf of Bengal and the Straits of Malacca. The provinces of Cachar and Assam, though holding out less promising prospects to commerce, help to form a well-defined and strong frontier; and in the approximation they afford to Thibet and China, our trade may possibly be extended, in process of time, in those directions. Nor was there wanting the consolation that the condition and prospects of some millions of natives were improved immeasurably by being placed under our rule. On the whole, the Burmese war is a grand episode in the history of the nineteenth century. Time has proved that the severe lesson the court of Ava received was not thrown away upon them. Since the year 1826, the Burmese have never attempted to trouble our frontiers, or to disturb the peace of any of our neighbours and dependants.

A.D. 1827.—His Royal Highness the Duke of York, presumptive heir to the throne, died after a short illness on the 5th of January. He was a prince of many high qualities; but in his private affairs, thoughtless, indiscreet, extravagant, and one of the readiest dupes that knavery could find. As commander-in-chief, he had been the friend of the common soldier, the benefactor of the army; and, although much, very much, remained to be done in the way of improvement, he indubitably left the army in a much better state than that in which he had found it. It has taken twenty years since his death to effect those reforms in the army which we now admire, and of which even the most prejudiced men, the most rigid adherents to the old system of harshness and severity, now acknowledge the inappreciable value. The duke had ever been

steady in friendship and warm in his affections ; and, in the case of officers of merit, the friendship he conceived for the father he extended after death to the children. In spite of his weaknesses he was assiduous as a man of business, and most punctual and constant in his attendance during all the office-hours at the Horse Guards. Within the walls of that edifice the name of Frederick Duke of York ought never to be mentioned but with respect.

Parliament reassembled on the 8th of February, when the prospects of the country were very flattering. The first important question brought under discussion was that of the Corn Laws. On the 1st of March, Mr. Canning proposed a scale of the average prices of the various kinds of grain within the kingdom, at which, upon the payment of a specified scale of duties, foreign grain should be admissible into the market. The debate upon the question was protracted, and there was a great divergency of opinion and theory. Ministers took the medium price of wheat at 60s. The landed interest would have taken it higher ; the manufacturing interest much lower. In the end the ministerial measure passed the House of Commons by large majorities.

The Catholic claims were revived by Sir Francis Burdett, who was charged with a petition from Ireland. The tone and attitude of the Catholics of that country had exasperated the English people ; and the table of the House was covered with anti-Catholic petitions. The tone of the Irish was indeed calculated to excite feelings of anger, or alarm, or annoyance, in unprejudiced minds. The Catholic Association, in about six months after it had been put down by law, reappeared under a new form, and pursued its object with more animation than ever. The "rent" was exacted from the people as usual, under the name of "free gifts." Part of this money was avowedly spent in influencing the elections of members of parliament. Mr. Daniel O'Connell and the other orators who presided over, and directed as they listed, this remodelled Association, preserved no measure towards England, or the religion or morals of the English people. Their ha-

rangues had been becoming, at every new meeting, more and more intemperate, and they had long been threatening and bullying the English and Scotch portions of the Union. The Union was to be abolished by the employment of a moral force (which could be moral only in the eyes of Irishmen, for it clearly and palpably involved the *dernier ressort* of hard blows), and the English were told that without the fertility of the Irish soil and the bravery of the Irish people, their country must be blotted out of the political map of Europe. All this was hard to bear by a proud people; but it ought to have been despised; and the ravings of demagogues and fanatic priests ought not to have been allowed to influence our legislative deliberations on the grand question of toleration.

Ever since Mr. Pitt's second administration, the Catholic question had been left in the cabinet an open one. Mr. Canning was as eager as ever to go the full length of emancipation: some of his colleagues, and foremost of all Lord Chancellor Eldon and Viscount Sidmouth, were strongly opposed to the measure, or to any farther concessions to the followers of the Roman Church. But Mr. Canning had now his foot on the step of the highest office in the government. The health of Lord Liverpool the Premier had long been declining. He had been seized with paralysis in the month of February; he partially recovered, but had a relapse which left him in a hopeless state. On the 28th of March, Mr. Canning attended the king on his majesty's summons to consider how the cabinet was to be continued. The king required that some one holding the opinions of Lord Liverpool on the Catholic question should be called to supply his place. Mr. Canning declared that if an opinion favourable to the Catholics was to be a disqualification for the office of prime minister, he would not be the individual in whose person that principle of exclusion should be established, and advised the king to form an anti-Catholic administration. His majesty, who knew the importance of retaining Mr. Canning, dissented, and nothing was settled at that meeting. The anti-Catholics thought they could count upon the Duke of Wellington and Mr. Peel; and

they were desirous that a new cabinet should be formed with Peel and Wellington at the head of it. But Mr. Canning's popularity was at its very spring-tide; difficulties stood in the way of any other arrangement; and on the 10th of April, the king commissioned Mr. Canning to propose a plan of his own for the re-construction of the ministry. To form an entirely pro-Catholic or pro-emancipation cabinet was still impracticable; and there was some difficulty for Mr. Canning in constructing any cabinet of which he was to be the head. The Duke of Wellington, Mr. Peel, Lord Westmoreland, Lord Chancellor Eldon, and Lord Bathurst preferred resigning. It was expected that these resignations would alarm the king and induce him to part with Mr. Canning; but his majesty confirmed the appointment of the great leader of the Commons as premier; and the announcement was vociferously cheered by the great majority of the House of Commons. One circumstance clouded the joy of the new premier's ardent friends: his health had been seriously affected; in December and January he had suffered a severe illness; and now the increase of toil, anxiety, and the perpetual excitement to which he was exposed, boded ill for his recovery.

Lord Melville joined his resignation to those who had followed the Duke of Wellington and Mr. Peel. There therefore remained of the Liverpool cabinet only Lord Harrowby, and Messrs. Huskisson, Robinson, and Wynne. The morning after the resignation of Lord Melville, who had been First Lord of the Admiralty, Mr. Canning brought about the appointment of the Duke of Clarence as Lord High Admiral—a dignity which had long lain dormant. As Lord High Admiral, the Duke of Clarence became head of the navy and supreme over the lords of the Admiralty. By the death of his elder brother, the Duke of York, his royal highness had become, and now was, presumptive heir to the crown. His acceptance of office under Mr. Canning is thought to have had no small weight among official men. Lord Bexley immediately retracted his resignation, and Sir John Copley, the *master of the rolls*, who had differed with Mr. Canning,

and had plainly intimated his intention of opposing him on the Catholic question, now condescended to become Lord High Chancellor, with a peerage by the title of Baron Lyndhurst. Lord Anglesey was appointed Master General of the Ordnance, with a seat in the cabinet, as successor to the Duke of Wellington. Mr. Sturges Bourne took the Home Department. To supply the remaining places in the cabinet, Mr. Canning opened a negotiation with the Marquess of Lansdowne and other Whigs. No official arrangements ensued ; but Lord Lansdowne, and the main body of the Whigs, with Sir Francis Burdett, and most of the Radicals that followed that baronet, volunteered their unofficial support of the new government. Upon Mr. Canning's appointment to the chancellorship of the exchequer, Mr. Prosperity Robinson was called to the House of Peers as Lord Goderich, and the accomplished Lord Dudley and Ward succeeded Mr. Canning in the foreign-office.

The House of Commons, which had adjourned on the 12th of April for the Easter holidays, reassembled on the 1st of May. Mr. Canning detailed the circumstances which had preceded his appointment as head of the government. "If," said he, "I had submitted in my person to the principle of exclusion as a friend to the Catholic claims, I should have dishonoured myself. Such a submission would have been a badge of Helotism, and the indelible disgrace of my political life." Mr. Peel behaved towards the new premier with marked kindness ; but Mr. Dawson, a brother-in-law of Mr. Peel, vehemently attacked the premier, and the junction of the Whigs with him. Mr. Brougham and Sir Francis Burdett vindicated their disinterested support of Mr. Canning's administration,—an administration likely to promote enlightened principles of government both at home and abroad,—an administration especially calculated to promote the cause of religious liberty.

In the Upper House explanations were given by *most* of the ministers who had resigned. In both *Houses* it was evident that the opposition to Mr. *Canning* would be vehement. A portion of the Whigs

joined the Tories in denouncing the new cabinet, and thereby increased the difficulties of the premier's position. Earl Grey made a formal declaration in the Lords that he withheld his confidence from the new ministry. Some of the Whigs, however, took office as soon as they saw that the premier was firmly seated. Before the close of the session, Lord Lansdowne became secretary for the home department; Lord Carlisle accepted the privy seal, and Mr. Tierney became master of the mint. But at the same time Mr. Peel put himself in an hostile attitude, and complaints were made to ring through the country of Mr. Canning's abandonment of his old party connections, of his latitudinarianism in religious questions, and of his too great boldness in political ones. The corn bill, which had been sanctioned by the late Lord Liverpool, was so cut and hacked in the Upper House, that Lord Goderich was induced to abandon it. To provide against a scarcity during the recess of parliament, a temporary bill was brought in by Mr. Canning, and was passed expeditiously through both Houses.

A fixed design to overturn the new administration, which in some respects lay under the odium attached to coalitions, was now very apparent. The strife of party was waged with very little moderation or delicacy. The genius of Mr. Canning was not respected as it ever ought to have been. The opposition in the House of Commons as well as in the Lords assumed a most formidable and irritating character; but though the premier was suffering under extreme anxiety of mind and sickness of body, his rhetorical powers and his sparkling wit never for one moment failed him. The impatient Whig reformers joined the Tories in attacking him. It was in these debates that Mr. Canning repeated his determination to oppose parliamentary reform, and declared himself hostile to the repeal of the test and corporation acts. On the test act, however, he had never before fully delivered an opinion to the House; and his *opposition to its repeal*, or the agitating that *question then*, may have arisen out of a natural fear of

complicating and prejudicing the Catholic question. All the more moderate Whigs were disposed to put off any serious discussion of the question of a sweeping reform; but the subject was, to some extent, forced upon parliament. The reports of the election committees had disclosed more than one scene of gross bribery and corruption. These scenes had been enacted chiefly at Colchester, Northampton, Leicester, Preston, and East Retford. Several motions were made; and a bill was brought in for "the more effectual preventing of bribery and corruption" in the Burgh of Penrhyn. Lord John Russell thought that the House ought to follow the example which had been set in the case of Grampound, and disfranchise the burgh altogether, with the ultimate view of transferring its rights to some of the great, populous, and unrepresented towns; and his lordship moved as an amendment, "and therefore the Burgh of Penrhyn shall be excluded hereafter from returning Burgesses to serve in parliament." The original motion was supported by the ministry; Mr. Canning, Mr. Sturges Bourne, and Mr. Charles Wynne, speaking in defence of it. They allowed that enough had been proved to call for the interference of the House, but not enough to induce it to proceed to total disfranchisement. Disfranchisement was a punishment which reached all, the innocent as well as the guilty; and it was scarcely fair to forfeit the rights of all the burgesses of Penrhyn, for the misconduct, however gross, of not more than one-half of the number. Mr. Canning, however, protested against its being supposed that, in such a case as Grampound, he should feel any difficulty in erecting a new representation in lieu of that which might be taken away, and, in giving his vote for the original motion, he would give it with reference to this particular case, avoiding the general question, and the general principles on which it was to be considered. Lord Althorp, Lord Milton, Sir John Newport, and Messrs. Ferguson, Hobhouse, and Brougham, supported Lord John Russell's amendment for total disfranchisement. *On a division the amendment was carried by 124 against*

69. No resolution was taken concerning the place to which the right should be transferred; but the populous and rich Manchester seemed to unite the suffrages of most of the members who adverted to the transfer.

Similar resolutions were adopted in regard to East Retford; and on the 11th of June, leave was given to bring in a bill to disfranchise that burgh also. Birmingham was held out as the place to which the franchise might conveniently and appropriately be transferred. But the session closed before any effective proceedings were taken for the disfranchisement of either of these burghs. The aim of the moderate Whigs now was to reform parliament gradually; to punish known instances of corruption; to transfer the rights of small rotten burghs to the great unrepresented cities; and gradually to extend the elective franchise until it comprehended a much larger portion of the population. They had at this moment no design of introducing into the constitution those extensive changes which were forced from parliament by the pressure from without in 1832.

Lord Althorp obtained the appointment of a committee to inquire into the mode of taking the poll at county elections; and Colonel Davies obtained a similar one to inquire into the mode of taking the poll at elections for cities and burghs. The principal object of Lord Althorp was to get rid, if possible, of the enormous expense of a county election. He stated that the last election for Yorkshire, though it had never come to a poll, had cost at least 120,000*l*. If a poll had lasted fifteen days it must have cost the contending parties half a million of money! On that occasion, a gentleman of large fortune, for whom the greatest show of hands appeared, was compelled to abandon all thoughts of standing a poll, in consequence of the ruinous expense which must have awaited him. Lord Althorp likewise brought in, and carried through, a bill for the better prevention of corrupt practices at elections, &c. The object of it was to prevent substantial bribery from being perpetrated under the mask of *merely giving employment*, and therefore to deprive all

persons of the right to vote who should be employed by a candidate in the election. It was notorious that at elections different nominal offices were created, to be filled by voters who were classed as plumpers, and who received double the pay of split votes. It was not meant that the provisions of the bill should apply to any real and fair agent of a candidate, but to that spurious collection which went under the names of runners, flagmen, &c., and musicians who had never played upon an instrument in their lives till they were enrolled at an election. This was just another mode of paying them for their votes, and therefore it was right that, in that election at least, they should have no voice. On the suggestion of Mr. Spring Rice it was farther determined, with the view of promoting the purity and diminishing the expense of elections, to prohibit the distribution of ribbons and cockades. This last suggestion led to a good deal of merriment. The anti-reformers contended that the prohibition of music, and ribbons, and cockades was absolutely ridiculous. It was not desirable to put an end to all the spirit and gaiety of an election; and, even if it were, this measure of Mr. Spring Rice would be utterly inefficient. It was downright folly to suppose that a short weak bill like this would make an English election as demure and orderly as a Methodist love-feast. Everywhere the electors voted for a particular colour; and "in point of fact," said Mr. Calcraft, who was unusually facetious, "without flags and ribbons the electors will not know whose heads they are breaking, and may knock down their friends under the mistaken notion that they are knocking down their foes." Now, as the bill confessedly was not to put an end to the breaking of heads, there was no use in misleading people to break the wrong heads. The bill, however, passed into a law: by its provisions any person who, within six months before an election, or during an election, or within fourteen days' after it, shall have been employed in the election as *counsel*, agent, attorney, poll-clerk, flagman, or in any *other capacity*, and shall have received in consideration of such employment, any fee, place, or office, or any

promise or security for a fee, place, or office, shall be incapable of voting at such election. A penalty of 10*l.* for each offence is inflicted upon every candidate who, after the test of the writ, or if parliament be sitting, after the seat has become vacant, shall directly or indirectly give to any voter or inhabitant "any cockade, ribbon, or other mark of distinction."

Mr. Spring Rice's portion of the bill must certainly be classed under the head of petty legislation.

During this session several attempts were unsuccessfully made to modify the invidious and oppressive Game Laws. Lord Wharncliffe, who, before his elevation to the peerage, had paid much attention to the subject, had carried through the Commons a bill which failed in the Peers. He now reproduced it in that Upper House. The provisions of the measure went, first of all, to remove the absurd and contradictory qualifications of the old law, and to substitute in their place the qualification of property; every proprietor being permitted to kill game on his own lands, whether his estate were large or small. His lordship next proposed to legalise the sale of game, as one great means of diminishing the temptations to poach, and as being in itself a just and reasonable thing. It was absurd to say to an alderman that he might purchase a turkey but not a partridge; experience had demonstrated that, in defiance of the law, game was supplied to the market as regularly as poultry; and surely it was imprudent, or worse than imprudent, to give unnecessarily to acts which could not be prevented the demoralising accompaniment of an habitual feeling of disregard for law and authority. Another object of the bill was to mitigate the severity of the punishments provided by the existing Game Laws for certain offences—a severity which did not carry the feelings of the country along with it, and led jurors to refuse to convict. The bill was allowed to be read a second time; but, on the motion that it should be read a third time, it was lost by a majority of one. The objections raised against it were, that it was delusive to think of checking poaching by giving the poacher a market wherein he might legally sell the game which he

had stolen; that the conferring the qualification on the small proprietor, and giving him the power of warning off and apprehending every intruder, would lead to endless lawsuits; and finally, that the bill would sweep away the whole existing system without putting anything more efficient in its place. In the course of the discussion Lord Harrowby said that, during the last three years, about 4500 persons had been imprisoned under the Game Laws, while the number in 1810, 1811, and 1812 had been only about 460. Since his lordship's speech the number of such imprisonments have lamentably increased; and the body of the English people can never be brought to believe that a man among them is a thief or robber, or that poaching is theft.

Lord Wharncliffe's bill being lost, the Marquess of Salisbury introduced another merely for legalising the sale of game under certain restrictions. The noble marquess proposed to empower all persons qualified by law to kill game to take out licences authorising them to sell game to licensed dealers. The measure was to be temporary, and to expire at the end of three years. This bill, too, was allowed to pass through a second reading, and was lost on the motion for the third reading by a majority of 16, the numbers dividing being 54 against 38. There was raised this sentimental objection,—the bill would deprive the sportsman of his highest gratification, which was the pleasure of furnishing his friends with presents of game! Nobody would care for a present which everybody could give!

One great alteration, however, was effected by a bill introduced by Lord Suffield, and eventually carried, for abolishing the barbarous practice of setting spring-guns and other engines of destruction for the preservation of game. Scotland was excepted from the operation of this new statute; for, while the bill was pending in parliament, the question of the legality of setting such murderous instruments was raised in that country in a court of law, and the decision of the question established that the *common law of Scotland* was far more hostile to the use of such instruments than was this new enactment in

England. On the 24th of June, James Crow, game-keeper to the Earl of Home, was brought to trial before the High Court of Justiciary upon an indictment which charged him with murder, inasmuch as he had set a spring-gun in one of the preserves on the earl's property, by which a man of the name of Guthrie had been killed. The prisoner's counsel, having objected to the relevancy of the charge, raised the general question, whether killing by a spring-gun, for the protection of property, was an indictable offence. The question having been argued by the solicitor-general and Mr. Dundas for the Crown, and by Mr. Jeffrey and Mr. Cockburn for the prisoner, the judges unanimously held the indictment to be good, and the charge to be a relevant charge. Lord Gillies, one of the six judges, could see no difference between shooting a man with a gun, and deliberating placing an engine so that he might be shot. Let the law of England be what it might, their lordships were not bound by it. Lord Pitmilley concurred in these opinions. To set spring-guns is an unlawful act, and therefore notice of having done so is no justification. Mr. Hume had laid it down to be unlawful to kill a poacher who persisted in searching for game. It could not, therefore, be lawful to plant an engine by which he might be killed. But, besides poachers, silly old women, children, and insane persons were exposed to deadly injury. Lord Mackenzie held it clear that no one could legally prevent the wrong of entering a plantation by killing the transgressing party. The law of Scotland had been tender of human life, and did not permit it to be taken away, except in cases of urgent and overwhelming necessity. Going farther than Lord Gillies, Lord Mackenzie held that not only the procurator-fiscal, but also any immediate neighbour, might apply for interdict against, or removal of, spring-guns. Lord Alloway held that there was less risk from an armed gamekeeper placed in a wood with orders to fire on trespassers, than from a spring-gun, which has no moral feeling and destroys indiscriminately. The lord justice clerk concurred. The general doctrine of the law, even in England, was that it will not

suffer with impunity any crime to be prevented by death, unless the same, if committed, could be punished with death. Poaching could not be so punished. Spring-guns, his lordship observed, were secret, deadly, and at the same time dastardly, engines. The persons who set them were frequently killed by them. It was an aggravation that they did in a secret, clandestine, and dastardly manner what durst not be openly attempted. The court were unanimously of opinion that such killing was murder by the law of Scotland. Our new statute had made it only a misdemeanour.

Out of office, as in office, Mr. Peel proceeded with his valuable improvements on the criminal law. Five acts were passed which consolidated into one body the whole of the law regarding offences against property, and cleared off an immense quantity of ancient rubbish and bewildering phraseology.

As chancellor of the exchequer Mr. Canning's task was easy and pleasant. There was a surplus of income applicable to the sinking fund; the supply demanded for this year did indeed exceed that of last year by 800,000*l*. This difference had been caused by the army extraordinaries, and by a vote of credit rendered necessary in consequence of the affairs of Portugal; but Mr. Canning said he intended to bring down the expenditure to the lowest possible scale consistent with the public service. It was the determination of government to apply their most strenuous and best efforts to the matter, and to call the house into council upon it.

Mr. Canning spoke in parliament for the last time on the 29th of June. Parliament was prorogued by commission on the 2nd of July.

On the 6th of July a treaty combining England, France, and Russia for a settlement of the affairs of Greece, and for the stopping of a horrible species of warfare, was signed at London. This was the last of Mr. Canning's public acts. One of the first poems he wrote in the enthusiasm of youth was a lament on "The slavery of Greece." *His classical mind* revolted at the idea of seeing the last and the glorious edifices of antiquity levelled with the

soil, and the last of the Greeks exterminated, or carried in captivity into Egypt. Like other generous-hearted statesmen, and like all the sympathizers in the Greek cause, he entertained fond hopes of improvement and regeneration, which, alas! the Greek people have not yet verified. In signing the treaty, and in feeling that he was chief in a deed which might restore Greece, if not to her ancient supremacy, to a respectable place among nations, he felt a joy which relieved the languor of disease. He went down to the Duke of Devonshire's pleasant seat at Chiswick to seek tranquillity after his many toils. The disease proceeded with a violence and rapidity which set the medical art at defiance; and Mr. Canning expired at Chiswick, in the very house in which Mr. Fox had breathed his last, on the morning of the 8th of August. He was only in the 58th year of age, and he had been prime minister for only four months. Thus prematurely was removed the most accomplished and liberal-hearted statesman, and the most perfect orator of his time—

“ Who show'd alone, or in the first degree,
Union so apt, such rich variety;
Taste guiding mirth, and sport enlivening sense,
Wit, wisdom, poetry, and eloquence;
Profound and playful, amiable and great,
And first in social life, as in the state.
Not wholly lost! thy lettered fame shall tell,
A part of what thou wast. Farewell, farewell!”*

The death of Mr. Canning left the ministry not only without a head, but also without a heart. Lord Dudley and Ward, who had a congenial genius, and who had been developing wonderful intellectual powers, was in so questionable a state of health and spirits as to forewarn his friends of the fearful hereditary disease which in a short time removed him from public life altogether. For the present, however, very few changes took place, and their effect was to bring back into office a portion of Mr. Can-

* Lines on the Death of Mr. Canning, by the Right Honourable John Wilson Croker.

ning's former friends. Lord Goderich became premier, and Mr. Huskisson succeeded him as colonial secretary. That portion of the Whigs who had made their way into the cabinet under Mr. Canning, wished to strengthen their party by bringing in Lord Holland; but the king was known to be averse to this nobleman, and the proposal was immediately overruled, ministers not thinking that circumstances called upon them to enforce his lordship's reception, or risk the return to power of their old opponents, by resigning. The only difficulty that was encountered lay in the appointment of a chancellor of the exchequer. The office was declined by Mr. Tierney, Mr. Huskisson, and Mr. Sturges Bourne; and was at last given to Mr. Herries, who had been secretary of the treasury under Lord Liverpool's administration, and who had resigned on the appointment of Mr. Canning. The Whigs of the cabinet were at first so dissatisfied with this nomination that the Marquess of Lansdowne waited upon his majesty to resign the seals of the home department. They objected to Mr. Herries both from old political ground and as being a nominee of the king. On its being explained, however, that it was not the king who had recommended Mr. Herries to Lord Goderich, but Lord Goderich who had recommended Mr. Herries to the king, the Marquess of Lansdowne and the rest of those Whigs consented to keep their places. Lord Harrowby retired from the presidency of the council. His place was taken by the Duke of Portland, and the Earl of Carlisle succeeded his grace as lord privy seal. Lord Dudley and Ward remained as secretary for foreign affairs; Mr. Huskisson united the war secretaryship to the colonial department; Lord Lyndhurst was chancellor, Lord Bexley chancellor of the duchy of Lancaster, &c.* This Goderich ministry was the third which the country had seen in the course of seven months. Infirm and tottering from its commencement, it yet lingered out a precarious existence of some five

* The Duke of Wellington now reassumed the command-in-chief of the army.

months and a half. Its infirmities were the subject of more melancholy jokes than had been perpetrated for a very long time.

Mr. Canning's triple alliance, by him solely conceived for the liberation of Greece, and for the love of humanity, was attended by consequences which he could have scarcely foreseen, which sorely crippled the Ottoman empire, and which consequently forwarded the ambitious views of Russia—views to which Mr. Canning had ever and most decidedly been opposed. In the autumn of 1827, the allied squadrons of England, France, and Russia constituted an imposing force in the Archipelago, and endeavoured to give effect to the treaty of London. Sultan Mahmoud, whose armies had suffered a terrible series of checks and defeats ever since the commencement of the war in 1821, had called in the assistance of the Egyptians; and an army of Egyptians, Arabs, Nubians, mercenaries, and adventurers from nearly all the southern side of the Mediterranean, were now ravaging the classical land, burning down the olive-groves of Attica, desolating the fair fields of Messina, and carrying fire and sword wherever they went. This army was commanded by Ibrahim Pasha, a son by adoption of the astute Mehemed Ali, and a man of uncivilized intellect and ferocious heart. Of civilization he had only learnt the modern military art—the art of killing with the greatest effect. The undisciplined Greeks could not stand against the trained troops of the Pasha; nor could the Greek flotillas, composed almost entirely of light-built trading polacca brigs, risk a contest with the ships of the line of the Sultan and Pasha of Egypt. The seas, from the mouth of the Adriatic to the strait of the Dardanelles, were, and had for three years been, swarming with Greek pirates, some being men who had escaped from starvation or from massacre on shore, but still more being desperadoes and inveterate plunderers who had betaken themselves to the profession from an innate love of it, or for the sake of the easy booty which might be picked up. These marauders respected no flag whatever; they fell upon the mercantile ships of England,

who had been their best and kindest friend during the war, as readily as they fell upon the trading ships of Austria, who, notwithstanding the neutrality she had agreed to at the congress of Verona, had been perseveringly and maliciously hostile to the cause of Greek independence. Thus, neither by land nor by water, was this state of things to be tolerated. But the double evil might have been checked without any illicit and extreme act on the part of the allies. On his side, the Sultan was blameable for an unreasonable obstinacy. In vain Mr. Stratford Canning urged upon the Divan the expediency and absolute necessity of conceding independence to the Greeks, and of becoming a party to the pacifying treaty : in vain the French ambassador seconded the British ; and in vain the allied admirals invited the Egyptian-Turkish commanders to cease hostilities and enter into the proposed arrangements. While our officers were treating with the officers of the Sultan and the Pasha, the Morea was in a blaze. The Greeks were but too happy to accept the armistice under the treaty. Ibrahim refused it, and went on burning and slaying as before. The allied admirals now declared to him that they had received positive instructions to stop the effusion of blood ; that they would reduce by force either of the two belligerent parties that should refuse to accede to the armistice ; that the Greeks had already accepted that armistice ; and that, if he resolved to continue hostilities, he would peril his fleet and the most essential interests of his sovereign. At last, Ibrahim Pasha gave way so far as to promise that he would stop the work of devastation on shore, and would not quit the Bay of Navarino upon any new enterprise against any part of Greece, until he should receive farther instructions from Constantinople. It is to be regretted that all this diplomacy was conducted in a slovenly style, and that no agreement was ever reduced into a formal written document. Trusting to the engagement which Ibrahim had come *under*, the allied squadrons sailed away, leaving an *English and a French* frigate to watch the harbour of *Navarino*, and the motions of the Turks and Egyptians.

They were scarcely gone ere Ibrahim put to sea with the view of sailing to Patras. On the 2nd of October, Admiral Sir Edward Codrington, being then at Zante, was informed of this breach of faith and of the continuance of atrocities on shore. With his own ship of the line, one frigate, and two brigs, the only force he had then in hand, Sir Edward sailed to meet the Turko-Egyptian fleet, or such portion of it as might have quitted Navarino. He soon discovered nine corvettes, two brigs, and nineteen transports sailing round the Morea and hugging the coast. He cleared his ships for action, and told the Turks and Egyptians that they must forthwith return to Navarino. They returned at his bidding. The excesses on shore were continued: women and children were put to the sword, every habitation that would burn was burned; the olive-trees, the vines, the mulberry-trees, were torn up by the roots in order to complete the devastation of the country. The three admirals—Codrington for England, de Rigny for France, and Hayden for Russia—consulted how they were to carry out the intention of the treaty of London in enforcing a *de facto* armistice. They concluded that they had only one of three courses to adopt.—1, To continue throughout the whole of the winter, a blockade, difficult, expensive, and perhaps useless, since a storm might disperse the squadrons, and afford to Ibrahim Pasha the facility of conveying his destroying army to different parts of the Morea and the islands which had hitherto escaped the horrors of war. 2, To unite the allied squadrons in Navarino itself, and to secure by this permanent presence the inaction of the Ottoman fleets; but this mode alone, it was reasoned, would lead to no termination of hostilities if the Porte should persist in its system. 3, To proceed to take a position with the squadrons in Navarino Bay, and then renew to Ibrahim propositions which, entering into the spirit of the treaty of London, were evidently to the advantage of the Porte itself.—It has been properly explained that this third proposition seemed just to mean that they would enter *the harbour and renew to Ibrahim their demands that*

he should desist from his military enterprises, under the alternative that, if he refused, they would attack his fleet; for, if they merely took a position with the squadrons in Navarino without opening their guns, they merely brought themselves into the circumstances of the second alternative. This last or third alternative was the one which the allied admirals agreed to adopt, in the hope, they said, "that it might produce a determination leading to the desired object without the effusion of blood, and without hostilities, but simply by the imposing presence of the squadrons." But these three gentlemen knew enough of Turkish and Egyptian obstinacy or determination to know that this imposing display of force would produce no effect, unless it were seconded by broadsides; and in determining to enter the harbour they must also have determined to fire on Ibrahim's ships in the event of his saying "No" to their demands. Their first movement towards the harbour of Navarino was an hostile movement. The Russians could not repress, and they scarcely attempted to conceal, their exultation. They professed an ardent zeal for humanity, an unquenchable desire to rescue their co-religionists the Greeks; but the real visions before their eyes were, the supremacy of their flag on the Black Sea so soon as the naval force crowded in Navarino should be annihilated, their own clear way to the Balkan mountains and to Adrianople, and finally the standard of the victorious Tzar floating over the Seven Towers or the palace of the Sultan and the mosque of Santa Sophia at Constantinople. On the 20th of October, at two o'clock in the afternoon, the combined squadrons passed the Turkish batteries to take up their anchorage in the bay. Not a shot was fired at them either by the batteries or by the ships; and without any interruption or remonstrance they were allowed to anchor in the harbour close to the Turkish and Egyptian fleet, which was moored in the form of a crescent. The force of the allies amounted to 26 ships of all rates, *carrying* 1324 guns; the Turks and Egyptians had 79 *ships, armed with* 2240 guns, and there were some heavy *batteries on shore*; but as the Mussulmans had only three

ships of the line and their opponents had 10 sail of the line, and as all their ships were crowded with men who had not the slenderest pretensions to pass as seamen, the allies can hardly be said to have fought at a disadvantage. Even after the interminable disputes which have been maintained upon this subject, there still survives a rational doubt as to which party fired the first shot, or as to the way in which this terrible battle really began. Admiral Sir Edward Codrington was greatly excited; most of his officers were in a fury against Ibrahim Pasha and his undeniable evil doings, and there was an inevitable hurry and confusion in some of the operations. Sir Edward had indeed given orders that not a gun should be fired unless the Turks and Egyptians began first. According to the received narrative, these orders were strictly obeyed, and the Mussulmans, on their side, although evidently making preparations, did not fire so much as a musket until a boat of the 'Dartmouth' frigate approached one of their fire-ships, when, naturally conceiving that boarding was intended, some soldiers on board the fire-ship discharged their muskets into the boat and killed a lieutenant and several of the boat's crew. Upon this the battle began. It soon became general; and dreadful was the carnage on board the crowded ships of the Mussulmans, who stood boldly to their guns, although the first ten minutes of the fight must have convinced them that theirs was altogether a hopeless struggle. The greatest danger to which the allied fleet was exposed, proceeded from the blowing up of the Turkish and Egyptian ships. For four hours the battle continued with unabated fury. It ended in the loss to the Sultan and Pasha of Egypt of three ships of the line, four or five frigates, and between 40 and 50 smaller vessels of war, there being included in the last number many beautiful and large corvettes, equal in size to our old frigates. The rest of the fleet surrendered, and a convention followed, by which Ibrahim Pasha evacuated the Morea, and the Greek prisoners whom he had sent over to Egypt as slaves were restored to their desolated country. The loss of the allies had been con-

siderable. The English, of course, came in for the greatest share of it; we had 79 men killed and 197 wounded. Among the killed was the veteran Captain Bathurst, who commanded the 'Genoa,' one of our line-of-battle ships. The Russians had 57 killed and 37 wounded: the French counted 43 dead and 117 wounded. In all 626 Christians were put *hors de combat* in this stern conflict with the Moslim. The French showed great ardour and emulation; but their firing was not good. The firing of the Russians was decidedly bad. Many of the poor Turks who escaped alive out of the battle and conflagration afterwards boasted that if there had been none but French and Russians they would have beaten them. By the battle of Navarino Greece was virtually dissevered from the Ottoman Empire, and a seal put to the Greek independence.

The news of the disaster, terrible as it was, did not dismay Sultan Mahmoud, or even ruffle his temper. The ambassadors of England, France, and Russia, who were at Constantinople when the battle was fought, and who, in other times, would have been torn to pieces by the Janissaries and the populace, were allowed to depart in safety, and without one insulting word being offered to them. Such of their countrymen as chose to remain were taken under the protection of the Turkish law, and had, in no single instance, cause to complain of the inefficiency of that protection. English merchandise and property to an immense amount were locked up in Constantinople, Smyrna, Salonica, and other Turkish towns: it was all as safe as if it had been warehoused in London or Liverpool. English travellers, who were at first stunned by the intelligence of the irregular battle, recovered courage as they perceived how the Turks bore their tremendous loss, and they continued their journeyings even in the interior of Asia Minor (where every man knew of the disaster, and where not a few had lost relatives and friends at Navarino), without molestation, insult, or injury of any kind.

But none were so thunderstruck by the intelligence of

the irregular fight as the cabinet of Lord Goderich. In this, as in other matters, the members of that cabinet knew not what course to pursue. At first they eulogized, and, to some extent, rewarded, the officers who had fought at Navarino,—thus virtually pronouncing their approbation of the affair. But then, disconcerted by the rumours and complaints that were afloat, they dispatched Admiral Sir John Gore to the Archipelago for the purpose of collecting information, and reporting thereon. This seemed indeed weak and inconsistent; but before the question could be debated in parliament, the disjointed administration fell to pieces.

A.D. 1828.—Lord Goderich resigned on the 8th of January. On the next day the king sent for the Duke of Wellington, and commissioned him to form an administration of which he should be himself the head. All the Whig members of the cabinet went out; but the principal friends of Mr. Canning remained in, and, with the exception of Lord Chancellor Eldon, who continued in retirement on account of age and infirmity, the Tories who had seceded at the period of Mr. Canning's appointment to be prime minister now returned to office. Lord Lyndhurst remained as chancellor; Mr. Goulburn became chancellor of the exchequer in lieu of Mr. Herries; Earl Bathurst became president of the council in lieu of the Duke of Portland; Mr. Peel became secretary for the home department, Lord Dudley and Ward remaining secretary for foreign affairs; Mr. Huskisson remained secretary for the colonies; Lord Melville was president of the board of control in the place of Mr. C. W. Wynne; the Earl of Aberdeen became chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster in the place of Lord Bexley; and Lord Palmerston remained secretary-at-war with a seat in the cabinet: the Duke of Clarence was continued in his extraordinary appointment of lord high admiral; the Marquess of Anglesey, who had been master-general of the ordnance without a seat in the cabinet, was now appointed lord-lieutenant of Ireland. Great pains were taken to attribute the dissolution of the Goderich administration to an awkward dispute between Mr. Herries

and Mr. Huskisson ; but it was quite evident that, without any dispute or quarrel, it must have speedily fallen to pieces from its own infirmities. Both Mr. Herries and Mr. Huskisson remained portions of the new ministry, Mr. Herries becoming master of the mint in lieu of Mr. Tierney, who went out. On becoming first lord of the treasury, the Duke of Wellington resigned the office of commander-in-chief of the army. Thus the ministry was almost entirely restored to what it had been under the premiership of Lord Liverpool. With the exception of Lord Lyndhurst as chancellor in place of Lord Eldon, and Lord Dudley as foreign secretary in place of Mr. Canning, the *personale* remained nearly unchanged. The old opposition alone was again totally excluded. The public, however, were not easily satisfied at seeing Mr. Huskisson and his friends still cling to office. His union with the new ministry displeased the personal friends of Mr. Canning, who thought that he displayed little regard to the memory of his friend in so soon taking place with those who had deserted that friend at his utmost need. The Whigs were not easily satisfied that he acted honestly in staying in when they were compelled to go out : they had thought that the conduct of those who resigned in April, 1827, when he adhered to Mr. Canning, had secured him from them for ever, and that he would remain faithful to the opposition benches, where, in that emergency, he had found protection and support. He was directly accused of having sacrificed principle to love of place. He was pledged, it was said, to measures to which the leading members of the new government could not but be hostile. On him depended the liberal policy of our commercial system ; he stood engaged to liberal measures in our foreign policy ; he was pledged in the cause of Catholic emancipation. These measures had formed the points of union among all the members of the late government ; but in every one of them the new government were either lukewarm, or would be guided by its *head in an opposite* direction. No beneficial alteration *in the corn laws* could, it was said, be expected under the

Duke of Wellington, who, in the preceding year, had thrown out the corn bill: Catholic emancipation had no more obstinate enemy; he was too intimately and personally connected with the monarchs of England to set any value on the rights of their subjects; and the policy of Mr. Canning, to protect Portugal and rescue Greece, would wither under his influence. The men who indulged in language like this (and they were found in parliament as well as out of it) forgot that every thing which had been done in regard to these topics, with the exception of the corn bill, had been done under Lord Liverpool, when the Duke of Wellington and Mr. Peel were members of the government. Neither of these statesmen had resisted Mr. Huskisson's amendments in the commercial code: it was the Duke of Wellington who had signed the protocol of St. Petersburg, on which rested our interference with Turkey in behalf of Greece; and, as to Ireland, the government was now just what it had been so long, and what even the last cabinet itself had been, a divided government. There was, in truth, much more of ignorance and prejudice than of sound sense in the clamour which was excited.*

To give time for carrying into effect the ministerial arrangements which followed the resignation of Lord Goderich, parliament had been prorogued from its appointed day of meeting till the 29th of January. On that day the session was opened by commission. Lord Chancellor Lyndhurst read the king's speech. That speech dwelt principally upon the affairs of Greece and Portugal. "His majesty," it said, "has viewed, for some time past, with great concern, the state of affairs in the east of Europe.

"For several years a contest has been carried on between the Ottoman Porte and the inhabitants of the Greek provinces and islands, which has been marked, on each side, by excesses revolting to humanity. In that contest the rights of neutral states, and the laws which

* *Annual Register for 1828.*

regulate the intercourse of civilized nations, have been repeatedly violated, and the peaceful commerce of his majesty's subjects has been exposed to frequent interruption, and to depredations too often aggravated by acts of violence and atrocity.

“ His majesty has felt the deepest anxiety to terminate the calamities and avert the dangers inseparable from hostilities which constitute the only exception to the general tranquillity of Europe. Having been earnestly entreated by the Greeks to interpose his good offices with a view to effect a reconciliation between them and the Ottoman Porte, his majesty concerted measures for that purpose, in the first instance, with the Emperor of Russia, and subsequently with his imperial majesty and the King of France. His majesty has given directions that there should be laid before you copies of a protocol signed at St. Petersburg by the plenipotentiaries of his majesty and of his imperial majesty the Emperor of Russia on the 5th of April, 1826, and of the treaty entered into between his majesty and the courts of the Tuilleries and of St. Petersburg on the 6th of July, 1827.

“ In the course of the measures adopted with a view to carry into effect the object of the treaty, a collision wholly unexpected by his majesty took place in the port of Navarino between the fleets of the contracting powers and that of the Ottoman Porte.

“ Notwithstanding the valour displayed by the combined fleet, his majesty deeply laments that this conflict should have occurred with the naval force of an ancient ally ; but he still entertains a confident hope that this *untoward event* will not be followed by further hostilities, and will not impede that amicable adjustment of the existing differences between the Porte and the Greeks, to which it is so manifestly their common interest to accede.

“ In maintaining the national faith by adhering to the engagements into which his majesty has entered, his *majesty will never lose sight of the great objects to which all his efforts have been directed,—the termination of the*

contest between the hostile parties—the permanent settlement of their future relations to each other—and the maintenance of the repose of Europe upon the basis on which it has rested since the last general treaty of peace.

“His majesty has the greatest satisfaction in informing you that the purposes for which his majesty, upon the requisition of the court of Lisbon, detached a military force to Portugal, have been accomplished. The obligations of good faith having been fulfilled, and the safety and independence of Portugal secured, his majesty has given orders that the forces now in that country should be immediately withdrawn.

“We are commanded by his majesty to inform you that his majesty has concluded treaties of amity and commerce with the Emperor of Brazil, and with the United States of Mexico, copies of which will, by his majesty’s commands, be laid before you.”

The speech also announced that a considerable increase had taken place in the export of the principal articles of British manufacture, and that this improvement of our foreign trade had led to a more general employment of the population.

In the Lords no amendment was proposed to the address, which was moved by the Earl of Chichester. The discussion which took place was confined almost exclusively to the state of our relations with Turkey, and to the propriety of the epithet “untoward,” applied in the king’s speech to the battle of Navarino. Lord Holland quarrelled with the phrase “ancient ally,” contending that the Turk could not be termed, in any correct sense of the words, an ally of this country at all, and much less “an ancient ally.” “The anti-social race,” said his lordship, “which now enjoys the throne of the Constantines, considers itself naturally at war with every nation with which it has not entered into a formal treaty of peace. But can a treaty of peace be fairly considered as a treaty of alliance? The first treaty made between this country and Turkey, I have no doubt, was considered by the *Turks as an act of grace and concession, yielded by them,*

in the plenitude of their power, to those dogs of Christians, the Nazarene nations. The privileges which were granted to our commerce were obtained from the Porte about 1679 by Lord Winchelsea and Sir John Finch. But how were they granted? Were the names of Lord Winchelsea and Sir John Finch subscribed to any treaty which secured them? No such thing: the privileges were granted as we would throw a bone to a dog. They were given, too, for very special reasons. The first reason was, because the messages which Charles II. had sent to the sultan were of an agreeable nature; the second, because Charles II. was considered to be a very powerful monarch among the Nazarene nations; and the last and most ludicrous reason was, because the sultan had heard that Charles was the arbiter of the differences among them. For those reasons the sultan granted our countrymen what was called by a sort of diplomatic euphonism 'certain capitulations,' but what I believe to have been called, in the Turkish language, 'boons,' or 'concessions.' Those concessions or capitulations were merely commercial: they gave to the subjects of Great Britain the same immunities which had been granted, on the same terms, to the subjects of France. We had, however, no political relations with Turkey, in any sense of the word, at that period. In 1692 we did indeed offer our services to mediate between the Emperor of Germany and the Turkish power, who were then at war; and we did so in order to leave our real ancient ally, the house of Austria, in a situation to direct her armies along with us against the then colossal power of France. And what was the result of that negotiation? We were accused by French writers—I shall not stop to examine whether rightly or wrongly—of having exercised our mediation with gross partiality, and of having inflicted by it a severe injury on the Ottoman empire. One of the articles in the treaty into which the Turks entered under our mediation was to this effect,—that they *should* surrender the whole of the Morea and of Greece *into the hands* of the Venetians. So that the result of *our first political negotiation with Turkey* was to wrest

Greece from its dominion ; though, unfortunately, not for ever. In the year 1718 we again entered into a political negotiation with Turkey, but under circumstances which, I contend, still preclude us from denominating her our ‘ancient ally.’ It is right, however, to state, that by that treaty we recognised Turkey as the sovereign of Greece, which a fatal war had enabled her to recover from the Venetians.” Lord Holland continued to go over our diplomatic history down to the invasion of Egypt by the French, and the expulsion of that army by the British, and from that point down to the year 1807, and Duckworth’s hostile expedition to the Dardanelles and Constantinople ; and there, at an unfair or premature point, he stopped. His lordship, in summing up this diplomatic review, said—“ I do maintain, then, that Turkey is proved to have been neither an ancient nor a faithful ally. We have preserved the relations of peace and amity, but we have done no more.” His lordship praised the battle of Navarino and Sir Edward Codrington. However much he might lament the effusion of blood which had taken place in that conflict ; however much he might lament that we had not yet accomplished the pacification of the two contending countries, and the liberation of Greece, that glorious country from which we derive no small portion of those virtues which exalt and dignify our nature, and to which we owe all that gives life and animation to our debates ; however much he might mourn over the deferred hopes of a gallant people, still, if by that word “untoward” it was meant to say that the battle of Navarino was an obstacle to the independence of Greece, he could not agree in such views. He looked upon it as a step, and a great step, towards the pacification of Europe ; and he considered it of more use than a contrary policy could have been in promoting that great and desirable object.

The Duke of Wellington replied with great weight and effect. His grace thought that the epithets which had excited Lord Holland’s disapprobation and spirit of research were in *both instances* fairly applicable. *The Ottoman empire, he said, had long been an ally of this*

country: the Ottoman power was an essential part of the balance of power; its preservation had been for a considerable number of years an object not only to this country, but to the whole of Europe. The revolutions and changes of possession which had taken place in recent times had increased the importance of preserving the Ottoman power as an independent state, capable of defending itself. His grace, with due eulogium, made reference to Mr. Stratford Canning's able and successful negotiation at Constantinople in 1812, and to the benefit conferred on the common cause of Europe in general, and to the mischief done to Buonaparte by the readiness with which the sultan had then made peace with the czar. Had it not been for the influence of the counsels of this country, at Constantinople, said his grace, the disaster of Napoleon in 1812, which led to the establishment of Europe in its present state, would not have occurred to the extent to which it did occur. As to designating the battle of Navarino an "untoward event," the sense in which the epithet was used was this: Under the treaty of July, it was particularly stated, as one of the stipulations of the alliance, that its operation was not to lead to hostilities, and that the contracting powers were to take no part in hostilities: therefore, when, unfortunately, the operations under the treaty did lead to hostilities, it certainly was an untoward occurrence. Mr. Canning's government, and the government of Lord Goderich, had alike expected to accomplish their object without hostilities: this was manifest both from the treaty itself, and from their providing such a force for the execution of the measure as rendered it almost impossible that there should be hostilities: and that being the case, when the measures of the late government assumed the character of hostility instead of that of peace, it was an untoward event.

The Marquis of Lansdowne faintly justified all that had been done at Navarino; and said that he should be *ashamed* not to declare that it would have been childish *to expect that*, when an armed interference had been *determined on by treaty*, it could take place without the

risk of war. Earl Grey, on the contrary, could not help considering the event as a most untoward and unfortunate one. Lord Eldon could not see how the epithet of "untoward" could be denied to hostilities taking place in the face of two treaties, one of which aimed at the re-establishment of peace, and the other provided that hostilities should not be committed.

In the Commons, although no amendment was moved to the address, there was considerable discussion, as in the Lords. Mr. Brougham called the battle of Navarino "a glorious, brilliant, decisive, and immortal achievement." It had been reserved, he said, for some of the men of these times to triumph and to be afraid—to conquer and to repine—to fight, as heroes did, the battle of freedom, and still to tremble like slaves—to act gloriously and repine bitterly—to win by brave men the battle of liberty in the East, and, in the West, to pluck from the valiant brow the laurels which had been nobly earned, and plant the cypress in their stead, because the conqueror had fought for religion and liberty. From Navarino Mr. Brougham leaped to the new ministry. He did not like a military head of the government. He thought the appointment of the Duke of Wellington a bad one in a constitutional point of view. No man valued more highly than he did the illustrious services of the noble duke, as a soldier; but, though he entertained the highest opinion of the noble duke's military genius, still he did not like to see him at the head of the finances of the country, enjoying all the patronage of the crown, enjoying the full and perfect confidence of his sovereign, enjoying the patronage of the army, enjoying the patronage of the church, and, in fact, enjoying almost all the patronage of the state. To the noble duke alone was intrusted the delicate function of conveying constant and confidential advice to the ears of his royal master. As a constitutional man, this state of things struck him as being most unconstitutional. He was, indeed, told, that the noble duke was a person of very great *vigour in counsel*, and that his talents were *not confined to the art of war*; it might be so, but that

did not remove his objections against the noble duke's being placed in possession of such an immense mass of civil and military influence. It was said that the noble duke was incapable of speaking in public as a first minister of the crown ought to do. Now he conceived that there was no validity in that objection. He happened to be present when the noble duke, last year, had the modesty and candour to declare, in another place, that he was unfit for the situation of first minister, and he really thought he had never heard a better speech in his life; nothing could be more suited to the occasion: this, therefore, was not his reason for objecting to the appointment. That objection rested on the constitutional grounds which he had already stated; and, moreover, it was inferenced by the fact that the noble Duke's experience had been purely military, not civil. He said in conclusion—and in words which will not soon fade from the popular memory: "Let it not be supposed, however, that I am inclined to exaggerate. I have no fear of slavery being introduced into this country by the power of the sword. It would take a stronger, it would demand a more powerful man than even the Duke of Wellington to effect such an object. The noble duke might take the army, he might take the navy, he might take the mitre, he might take the seal—I would make the noble Duke a present of them all. Let him come on with his whole force, sword in hand, against the constitution, and the energies of the people of this country will not only beat him, but laugh at his efforts. There have been periods when the country heard with dismay that 'the soldier was abroad.' That is not the case now. Let the soldier be ever so much abroad, in the present age he can do nothing. There is another person abroad—a less important person, and in the eyes of some, an insignificant person—whose labours have tended to produce this state of things. The 'school-master is abroad!' And I trust more to the school-master, armed with his primer, for upholding the liberties of the country, than I fear the soldier with his bayonet."

We believe that no person now in the country would

be more ready to confess that the statements of Mr. Brougham as to the excessive, all-absorbing patronage of the Duke of Wellington, was incorrect, and that the apprehension of the duke's unconstitutionality was utterly unfounded, than Henry Lord Brougham and Vaux. We conceive also that the noble lord would now as readily admit that if the schoolmaster was abroad in 1828, it was within very narrow limits. For the purposes of a true national education, in a vast portion of England, the schoolmaster was not only not abroad, but he was not even out of his bed. What now remains to do, and what in the year 1847 seems about to be done or attempted, sufficiently proves how restricted was the schoolmaster's range in 1828. It is not by flattering the country with a false notion of education and civilization, that education will be advanced. Nor is it by sacrificing to the tastes and stooping to the intellectual level of the uneducated or half-educated masses, that sound national literature will be promoted. The happiness of the greater number may be a glorious principle in policy; but to please the greater number is a most mischievous principle in literature.

Mr. Bankes censured the battle of Navarino, and censured the treaty of July which had led to it, as impolitic and unjust. Was it British policy to interfere in the internal affairs of other nations? Was it not contrary to the law of nations to do so? and had they not, by the treaty into which they had entered, violated that law? The treaty was founded on a false pretence, for they were told that the intention was to put down piracy. But, was it necessary for England, the greatest naval country under the sun, to call to her assistance two other powers to check and put down a system of Greek piracy? Were we not at peace with Turkey when we entered the bay of Navarino and destroyed her fleets? Lord Althorpe acknowledged that with respect to the treaty of July he entertained considerable doubts both of its policy and of its justice.

Lord Palmerston argued that the royal speech contained *no condemnation* of the battle of Navarino—that

it censured or condemned nothing. There was in it no censure upon the treaty which had led to the battle, nor any blame of the gallant admiral who had commanded in it. The speech said, that the conflict was unexpected; and, certainly, there could be no doubt that it had been so. Because, although some collision might have been anticipated, yet the affair at Navarino took place in a way which could not have been expected. It had arisen out of a combination of circumstances which could not be foreseen. He thought it impossible that his majesty could be advised to allude to such a battle without some expression of regret—a battle which had taken place between his ships and the fleets of a country with which we were not only not at war, but with which we were absolutely on terms of alliance. His lordship did not overlook Mr. Brougham's constitutional scruples about the military premier. The military office ordinarily held by the noble duke was not to be united to the political. His grace had tendered to the king his resignation of the office of commander-in-chief on the same day that he had accepted that of first lord of the Treasury; and, although no successor had as yet been appointed, the House might consider the resignation as virtually made. From the present time, the Duke of Wellington would cease to be commander-in-chief. "Another objection," said Lord Palmerston, "to the present prime minister is, that he, the noble duke, has habits and experience which are wholly military and not civil. But there has scarcely been one important transaction in Europe for the last thirteen years in which the Duke of Wellington, at home or abroad, had not directly borne a part."

Lord John Russell hinted that some portion of the patronage of the army would still remain at the disposal of the Duke of Wellington in his new capacity. As for the affair in the Archipelago, it had his lordship's entire approval. He believed the battle of Navarino to have been a glorious victory, and a necessary consequence of the treaty of London; and, moreover, as honest a victory *as had been gained since the beginning of the world.* On the 11th of February Lord Goderich gave rather a

lame history of the decline and fall of his own administration ; and many explanations were entered upon by others. Mr. Huskisson, subsequently to the change of government, had declared in an election speech at Liverpool, that before he consented to join the Duke of Wellington he had obtained "guarantees from the duke." This was not language to be used by a subaltern in speaking of the premier. The Duke of Wellington was very naturally angered at the expression ; and in the House of Lords he denied that he had ever given any guarantees, and asked what right Mr. Huskisson had to set himself above any other member of the cabinet. Mr. Huskisson received the rebuke with what was generally considered a very meek, if not discreditable submission. He said that far too wide an interpretation had been given to his words ; that when he used the word "guarantee," he meant only the security of having his friends, Lord Dudley, Lord Palmerston, Mr. Grant, and Mr. Lamb in the cabinet, and the assurance that general liberal principles would be pursued. "When," said he, "I spoke of 'guarantee' in the way I did, the people of Liverpool were aware that I was not speaking of an instrument under hand and seal covenanting for the execution of some particular engagement—that, in fact, I was alluding only to assurances and understandings that my colleagues would not sacrifice any principle or forego any measure which they considered essential to the interests of the country."

While explanations were taking place regarding the share which a dispute about the nomination of a chairman of a finance committee had had in dissolving the Goderich ministry, the committee itself had been named under the new government. The motion was made by Mr. Peel, who prefaced it by a general review of the financial condition and prospects of the country, and of the objects which it was proposed to gain by the appointment of the committee. He would attempt, he said, to consider the state of the finances, on precisely the same principles which an individual would apply to *his private concerns*. He made it appear that a reduc-

tion of forty-eight millions and a half in the debt, funded and unfunded, had taken place since 1815, and that the actual capital of the unredeemed debt was 777,476,000*l*. The labours of the committee were very multifarious; and in its report several valuable suggestions were made. This finance committee had very soon convinced itself that the annuities occasioned loss to the public. Nothing could be done to alter those which had been already sold; but, on the recommendation of the committee, a bill was brought in, and speedily passed, to suspend the operation of the Act under which they had been granted, so that no new annuities might be created until a more correct system should be settled.

One grant of money met with unexpected and ungracious opposition. Mr. Canning had died a poor man. He had begun the world without fortune; he had spent his life in public service; the emoluments of the offices which he had held at different times, being added to the income derivable from his wife's property, had scarcely sufficed to cover the expenses of his station. He had never had either the means of accumulating wealth or the taste and wish to do so. Pitt, though an unmarried man, had not been more indifferent to money than Mr. Canning. In 1822 he had been on the point of proceeding as governor-general to India; from which, as his friends calculated, he might have returned in a few years with an independent fortune. But it is at the least quite as probable that he would have done nothing of the sort, and that, like other high-minded governors-general and governors of presidencies, he would have returned from the East as poor as he went to it. The experiment, however, could not be tried, for the death of Lord Castlereagh and the necessities of government kept him at home as foreign secretary. He held no sinecures; and his sudden death left his family but poorly provided for. On these grounds the chancellor of the exchequer, on the 13th of May, brought before the House a proposal for granting to one of Mr. Canning's sons a pension of 3000*l*. a-year. This was the only mode of giving it. When the sinecure places, which had been usually

bestowed along with the high offices of government, were abolished by the 57 Geo. III., that statute had empowered his Majesty to grant pensions, not exceeding in all 40,000*l.* per annum, to the holders of public offices who should have filled their offices for a period not less than two years. To one of these pensions Mr. Canning would have been entitled if he had lived; but the Act contained no provision for granting it to his family on his death. The Chancellor of the Exchequer therefore moved, in a committee of supply, that the chairman be directed to bring in a bill to enlarge and amend the 57 Geo. III. All he proposed was, to give his majesty the power of granting to one of Mr. Canning's sons the pension to which, under that Act, Mr. Canning himself would have been entitled; this mode of providing for the family seemed to him much less onerous than the voting a large sum for the payment of debts.

The proposition was vehemently opposed by Lord Althorpe, Sir M. Ridley, Mr. Joseph Hume, Mr. Bankes, Mr. Monck, Col. Sibthorpe, Sir R. Ferguson, Mr. Poulett Thompson, and Mr. D. W. Harvey. While all these gentlemen admitted the splendid abilities of the deceased statesman, they opposed the grant, some of them on grounds of economy, some of them on the ground that it had not been deserved from the country. Many took very different views of Mr. Canning and his policy at different periods of his life. Thus the claim was resisted on contradictory grounds. One member held that the errors of Mr. Canning's later years, or since the period when he had advocated liberal views, had cancelled all the merit of his earlier life; another maintained that the errors of his earlier life had not been blotted out by the merits of his later years; but generally the Whig party in the country held stoutly to the opinion that all these errors had been blotted out by Mr. Canning's conduct ever since 1822.

Ministers were unanimous in supporting the proposition,—and it is thought that they were the warmer, as the late schism between some of them and Mr. Canning might be supposed to have engendered some personal

animosity. They were supported by many of the most active leaders of the opposition,—by Lord Milton, Sir James Mackintosh, Sir Robert Wilson, Sir John Newport, Sir James Scarlett.

The merits of the question were placed on this broad ground,—Mr. Canning throughout life had devoted talents of the very first order to the service of his country, and, in following that service, had not merely lost the means of improving, but had positively deteriorated his private fortune. And what had he not surrendered in giving up the government of India to fill up the unprofitable office of foreign secretary? and this sacrifice he had made solely from a principle of public duty. “I regret,” said Mr. Huskisson, “to be obliged to make reference, on such an occasion, to information derived from the privacy of confidential intercourse; but I can state upon my own personal credit, that, whatever were the feelings of others who were justly near and dear to Mr. Canning, it had for years been his own warm and anxious wish (owing to circumstances that were likely to press upon the acute and sensitive mind of such a man) to be placed in some public situation, however it might sacrifice or compromise the fair and legitimate scope of his ambition, which, while it enabled him to perform adequate public services, would enable him also to place upon a better footing his wife’s private fortune, which he had lessened, and the inheritance of his children, which he had impaired. I will not go so far as to say that this was a prospect fixed upon Mr. Canning’s mind, or an object that he was bent upon pursuing, for it is difficult to trace the springs of so susceptible a temperament; but under the circumstances, it was quite natural, considering his means and his family, that while he honourably sought a situation to render service to his country, he should not be unmindful of the means of repairing the family fortune which he had diminished while in the service of his country.” But it had been *said*, that when Mr. Canning preferred the foreign office to the government of India, he had exercised his *option*, and must have considered what he received as an

equivalent for what he abandoned. That was to say, no man in public sacrifices his own pecuniary interest to the public service; for if it were meant that Mr. Canning found in the office which he assumed a due equivalent, in so far as ambition was concerned, still, on what principle was a man's family to be left in poverty, because his ambition had been exerted for the public good? "Why should the gratification of ambition," said Mr. Peel, "in holding high situations in the State, form of itself a sufficient reward. When they saw individuals acquiring high honours and great emoluments at the bar and in other professions, why should they turn round to the family of a minister, now no more, and say to them, 'The gratification of ambition was his reward. It is true he gave his services to the State, but we will not listen to your claims for reward from his country, because your parent was satisfied with the gratification of his ambition.' This would be a low and niggard way of dealing with public men. In the present case, there was everything which could make out a claim, and nothing which could make it suspicious as an example; for, alas! similar talents so employed, would but rarely appear. Mr. Canning for twenty years had held high stations in the government—he had brought to the service of the State, according to his views of policy, most splendid talents,—and he had discarded, during his whole career, all feelings of private and personal interest. There was here arrayed, therefore, that combination of circumstances which would prevent the present from being drawn into any inconvenient precedent hereafter."

It was urged that the proposition touched no political principle, and did not imply the abandonment of any one political dogma. If the motion were to vote Mr. Canning a public monument to commemorate his services, members who did not believe that he had performed any services to be remunerated would do right to oppose it; but when the motion was only to reward his family, they had merely to consider the fact, whether he had devoted his *splendid talents* to the public service to the *detriment of his private interests*.

Sir James Mackintosh said, " that the question, in his view of it, did not depend on and did not compromise in any way the political opinions of any man. The terms upon which he would be content always to entertain a claim for compensation to any public man were these: he would allow it to every man who could be shown to have employed illustrious talents in that course of policy which he believed to be beneficial to the country, for a time so long, and in a situation so elevated, that no fair difference could arise as to his pretensions. This was the principle upon which he should be disposed to try every public officer's claim to honour or reward; and if this principle was not admitted by the house, and if he was asked how he came forward to support the vote in discussion, having himself been often opposed to Mr. Canning, the objection taken would amount to this—that no national honour hereafter could be conferred upon any man; because, in a free country like ours, if difference of political opinion was to justify difference upon a question like this, it was utterly impossible that any man of sufficient power to command attention could ever get through a political life without doing a great many acts which must clash with the interests or affront the prejudices of some of the parties who surrounded him. If this cause of opposition was recognised, there was an end to the fair expression of public feeling as to any man. That which was done must be the result of the numerical force of party. A victorious faction might have power to give a monument to its chief; but the country at large would no longer have the power to evince its impartial sense of the talents and demerits of its servants. Death, the thought of departed honour, and the memory of departed genius, these were objects which no good or generous mind could approach without sentiments of respect. They were recollections, before which party quarrels would fade, in company with which the thought of personal differences could not *be maintained*. On the claim of merit alone, therefore, *he would judge of such grants as that now proposed; and who would venture to deny to Mr. Canning the*

praise of merit?" "That he was a man of the purest honour," said Sir James, "I know. That he was a man of the most rare and splendid talents, I know. That he was a man renowned through Europe for his brilliant genius and philosophic thinking, not a member of this house can be ignorant; or that with his best zeal, as well as with success, he applied that genius and those views of policy to advance the service and the glory of his country. If there were those from whom he had differed—and can it be doubted that every politician must have some opposed to him?—if there were some from whom he had differed, even widely—politically or personally—this is not an hour when those differences ought to be recollected. A friendship of thirty-six years with him, has given me, I confess, and I am not ashamed to own it, a deep interest in any measure which is intended to do honour to his memory. An humble place in his friendship was all that Mr. Canning ever had the opportunity of bestowing upon me; but I feel that it was the greatest boon and the most honourable by which I ever could have been distinguished." "But though private friendship," continued he, "was a fair auxiliary ground for influencing the vote of any man, he would not listen to it as a main ground. The claim of merit, above all considerations, was that on which such a vote should rest, and was the only thing which such a vote required. Principle having clearly pointed out the duty, friendship sweetened its performance. On the other hand, personal enmity ought not to be *allowed* to have the slightest weight in such a decision. It was a feeling always, heaven knew, which the infirmity of man found it hard to curb, but it ought to be restrained—it must be, in a discussion like the present. The distribution of posthumous honours ought peculiarly to be sanctified by the silence of all spirit of passion or dislike. *Mors obruat iras*, was a maxim which the least temperate would hardly gainsay. In the same way the opinion which an individual might entertain of the measures of any great statesman, would have its weight as an auxiliary influence in a question like that before the house. But this in-

fluence ought to be tolerated only where it exerted itself in favour of the party. Approbation of a statesman's measures would and might fairly operate as an additional inducement to give a favourable voice upon such a vote ; but it was only in a very extreme case indeed—such a case as certainly could not be supposed in the present instance—that our mere disapprobation of measures could justify a negative. The present vote seemed one of little possible difficulty. The main ground of granting it was one of general principle and clear. The auxiliary grounds might be various ; some would be inclined to support the vote from approbation of one part of Mr. Canning's life,—others, from admiration of another. Any one of those grounds might fairly be admitted as an influence in voting for the grant ; but let honourable members recollect that it was only some strong and unequivocal cause of disapprobation which could justify their voting against it."

The motion for bringing in the bill was carried by a majority of 161 to 54. On the motion for bringing up the report, after the bill had passed the committee, Mr. Hume again divided the house on an amendment that the report should be received that day three months. The amendment was negatived by 73 against 14, and the bill passed both houses without further opposition.

As Mr. Canning's elder son was in the navy, and his life consequently exposed to many casualties, the pension was granted for the life of the second son. In the course of this very year the elder son was drowned while serving on a foreign station.

On the 26th of February, Lord John Russell introduced the consideration of the Sacramental Test and Corporation Acts, and moved that they should be referred to a committee of the whole house, with a view to their repeal. His lordship prefaced the motion by a review of the history of the two statutes, from which he inferred that they had been originally enacted for reasons which no longer existed ; and he maintained the justice and expediency of repealing them, for as much as that, while these tests were an infliction on the dissenters,

which only the most imperative necessity could justify, they did in truth afford the Church of England no protection, but exposed her, on the contrary, to dangers to which she otherwise would not be obnoxious. Without serving any good purpose, they made the dissenters irritated enemies, smarting under a continual sense of injustice, instead of converting them into peaceable and amicable companions, if not into cordial friends. The motion was seconded by Mr. J. Smith, one of the leaders of the dissenting interest, and was supported by Lords Althorpe, Milton, and Nugent, and by Messrs. Brougham, Ferguson, and R. Palmer. Ministers had determined to resist the motion, and the opposition to it was conducted by Mr. Huskisson and Mr. Peel. They, however, did not fight the battle with much determination, and they took up very narrow ground. They abandoned the principle on which the acts in question were founded, and they defended them as being provisions which led to no actual hardship. Mr. Huskisson said he was free to confess that he was no friend to the principle of religious tests in reference to civil rights. He would be glad to see all such tests abolished. But he doubted whether the present motion was calculated to remove any urgent grievance. The grievances complained of were of an imaginary character; for he had yet to learn what obstacles existed against the honourable ambition of the dissenters. They were qualified to fill the first offices in the army and navy, and they had their full share of the civil power of the country. Forty years had elapsed since this subject had been last agitated in Parliament; that period had been marked by many eager discussions on another great question (the Roman Catholic) involving the principles of religious liberty; but during all that time the parties most interested in the motion of Lord John Russell had preserved a total silence. If an oppressive grievance had existed, if any wrong had been committed, would the Protestant dissenters have failed to remonstrate against the continuance of the system. But Mr. Huskisson's principal objection to the motion was founded on this, that its success would be unfavourable

to the Catholic claims. However anxious he might be to see religious tests removed, yet when he found them in existence, he was bound to look at the system as a whole, one part of which could not be properly dealt with unless reference were made to all the rest. He was supported by the high authority of Mr. Pitt. From the recently published correspondence between his late majesty and Mr. Pitt in 1801, it would be seen how anxious that minister was to modify the laws which affected the dissenters, and it would also be seen that, notwithstanding his great anxiety upon that head, he was opposed to any modification whatever of them, until the Catholic question had been settled. Then, and not till then, did Mr. Pitt conceive that a proper opportunity would arise to take those laws into consideration with a view to their revision and modification. Mr. Peel acknowledged that the question was attended with considerable difficulty. He was not prepared to say that it was essentially interwoven with the interest of the Church of England. He did not think that the two were so connected that the Church of England must fall if the Test and Corporation Acts were repealed. He, too, could see no sign of any existing oppression or grievance to the dissenters. It had been said that Test Acts shut dissenters out from the higher offices of government. "For an answer," said Mr. Peel, "look at the ministry! Of the fourteen members who compose the present cabinet, three, Lord Aberdeen, Lord Melville, and the president of the board of trade, are Scotsmen and good Presbyterians, whom these acts have not succeeded in shutting out. Then, even in England, what was the fact as to corporations? He believed that dissenters were not practically excluded; that, last year, the lord mayor of London had been a Protestant dissenter. He was convinced that in general the law was not found to be a practical grievance. The fact was that the existing law gave merely a nominal predominance to the established church. All the arrangements and intercourse between the dissenters and the established church had been

marked of late years by the most perfect cordiality ; and he regretted that any chance should be hazarded by which it was possible that that temperate and candid feeling should be interrupted." Lord John Russell's motion was, however, carried by 237 against 193. This was considered as the first successful blow that had been aimed at the supremacy of the established church since the revolution of 1688. Some security for that church was engrafted on the bill by ministers, and some slight precautionary alterations were made in the house of lords, where the entire body of the bill was strongly opposed by the ex-Chancellor Eldon. Lord Eldon said he could not consent to give up the constitution, as well as the church establishment, to the extent that the present bill proposed. He could not do this. It must be the work of others. Be they within or without the church, it mattered not to him. His prayer to God was, that the individuals who promoted this measure might have often the satisfaction of thinking, that, as they had intended no mischief to the church, no mischief had ensued. But at the same time that he gave them credit for sincerity, he claimed a similar allowance for himself, when he solemnly said, as he then did from his heart and soul, " Not content " to the present bill.

The repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts was immediately followed up by a motion for removing the Catholic disabilities. On the 8th of May Sir Francis Burdett moved " That the house do now resolve itself into a committee of the whole house for the purpose of taking into consideration the state of the laws affecting his majesty's Roman Catholic subjects in Great Britain and Ireland, with a view to such a final and conciliatory adjustment as may be conducive to the peace and strength of the United Kingdom, to the stability of the Protestant establishment, and to the general satisfaction and concord of all classes of his majesty's subjects." The debate was continued on the 9th and 10th. The principal speakers in support of the motion were Mr. Brougham, Mr. M. Fitzgerald, Sir J. Newport, Sir J. Mackintosh, Mr. C. Grant, Mr. North, and Mr. Huskisson. It was

opposed by the solicitor and attorney general, Sir Robert Inglis, Mr. Moore, Mr. Leslie Forster, Mr. Banks, and Mr. Peel. On the division the motion for a committee was carried by a majority of six ; in the preceding session it had been lost by a majority of four. In the committee, the resolution, " That it is expedient to consider the state of the laws affecting his majesty's Roman Catholic subjects, with the view of effecting such a final adjustment of them as may be conducive to the peace and strength of the United Kingdom, the stability of the Protestant establishment, and the general satisfaction and concord of all classes," was agreed to ; and here the Commons stopped. Instead of further and more detailed resolutions being moved, or a bill being brought in to give effect to the general resolution which had been carried, it was resolved to ascertain the sentiments of the House of Lords. Therefore, on the 16th of May, it was agreed, on the motion of Sir Francis Burdett, that the general resolution which had been carried should be communicated to the Lords in a free conference.

The conference was held on the 19th, the managers for the lords being Earl Bathurst, the Duke of Devonshire, Earl Grey, the Marquess of Londonderry, the Earl of Eldon, the Bishop of Durham, and Lord Colchester. These peers having received the resolution, it was forthwith read in their house, and ordered to be taken into consideration on the 9th of June.

The debate lasted two days. It was opened by the Marquess of Lansdowne, who moved that the House should concur with the Commons. The marquess was supported by the Dukes of Sussex and Gloucester, by Lord Goderich, Lord Plunkett, the Marquess Wellesley, the Marquess of Londonderry, Earl Grey, and the Earl of Haddington. It was strenuously resisted by some of the ministers, and by Lord Eldon, the Earl of Winchelsea, the Marquess of Salisbury, the Archbishop of Canterbury, and others. The opposition of the Duke of Wellington was but faint. His grace disapproved of *the agitation which was carried on in Ireland by Mr.*

O'Connell and his party. It would be well, he said, to allow the public mind to cool; and, in the end, it might be possible to do something, for he was most desirous of seeing the subject brought to an amicable conclusion. The whole tone of the duke was conciliatory; and although the motion was lost by a majority of 44, the contents being 137, and the not-contents 181, the friends of emancipation were convinced that the hour was fast approaching in which their wishes would be gratified.

Mr. Huskisson had pledged himself to vote for the transfer to Manchester of the elective franchise which East Retford was held to have forfeited by its corruption. Ministers, however, had entertained no such project; and the House of Commons had resolved that, instead of the burgh of East Retford being disfranchised, the right of voting should be thrown open to its adjoining hundred. After having voted against his colleagues, Mr. Huskisson addressed a letter, marked "private and confidential," and enclosed in a cabinet box to the Duke of Wellington. In this letter he said, that after his vote on the East Retford question, he thought it his duty, "without loss of time, to afford him (the duke) an opportunity of placing his office in other hands." The duke immediately laid Mr. Huskisson's letter, as a resignation, before the king. Mr. Huskisson now declared that he had never intended to resign—that his letter was "private." The duke maintained that the letter was, to all intents and purposes, a resignation, and an official letter—which it indisputably was. Lord Dudley and Ward called on the duke and told him it was a mistake. The duke replied, "It is no mistake—it can be no mistake—it shall be no mistake." His grace also said that the resignation was Mr. Huskisson's own act, and not his. After making repeated and humble entreaties, which he miscalled explanations, to the Duke of Wellington, Mr. Huskisson requested an interview with the king, in the hope of finding his royal master more placable. The duke, however, *did not think proper to advise his majesty to grant an audi-*

ence to Mr. Huskisson until the correspondence between that gentleman and his grace should be at an end. But the duke said to Lord Dudley, "Huskisson is a man of sense, and knows well what should be done to settle the whole matter, and bring it to an end." His grace hereby meant that Mr. Huskisson should withdraw his letter, which, while it remained, was a recorded resignation. But Mr. Huskisson was too proud to act upon the duke's hint. His pride, coming after the exhibition of so much humility, being indeed very much out of place. His letter had been written on the 2nd of May, and it was unrecalled on the 25th, on which day the Duke of Wellington wrote to him—"My dear Huskisson—It is with great concern that I inform you that I have at last attended his majesty, and have received his instructions respecting an arrangement to fill your office." Mr. Huskisson, in giving his own explanation of these occurrences in the House of Commons, insinuated that he had been made a scapegoat or a peace-offering to gain the support of persons who would join the ministry only on condition that he, and with him all chances of improvement, should be removed; and he made a violent attack on the noblemen and gentlemen who celebrated the birth-day of Mr. Pitt (the 28th of May), as if their approaching festivities had a connexion with his downfall.

Along with Mr. Huskisson went out Lord Dudley and Ward, Lord Palmerston, and Mr. C. Grant. The Earl of Aberdeen now became foreign secretary; Mr. Huskisson was succeeded in the colonial office by Sir George Murray; Sir Henry Hardinge became secretary-at-war in lieu of Lord Palmerston, and Mr. V. Fitzgerald was put at the head of the board of trade in place of Mr. Grant. Mr. Huskisson forthwith retired for a time to the Continent. The folly of his recent conduct ought not to weaken the recollection of the services he had rendered to commerce and his country; and the lamentable, tragical death which so very soon overtook him, ought to obliterate every angry feeling towards him.

At an early period of the session, Mr. Brougham, in

a speech which occupied nearly six hours in the delivery, advocated again a sweeping law reform, and concluded with the motion for an address to the king requesting the issue of a commission of inquiry into the state of the law and constitution of the courts. Nothing like the extensive design of Mr. Brougham was carried into effect ; but in the course of the session two commissions were issued for inquiry into the state of the common law and the law of real property.

Ministers brought in a new corn bill, with the sliding scale, government being still convinced that a scale of varying duties was the best expedient for doing equal justice to all parties interested. The medium or pivot price, which Mr. Canning would have fixed at 60s., was now raised to between 64s. and 65s.

The session was prorogued by commission on the 28th of July, the speech delivered regretting that hostilities had commenced between Russia and Turkey, and that his majesty's just expectations had been disappointed in Portugal.

Another change in the ministry happened during the autumn. The Duke of Clarence resigned the unusual and, in his hands, expensive office of lord high admiral ; the admiralty was again put into commission, and Lord Melville was reinstated at the head of the board.

The battle of Navarino had left the sultan without a fleet wherewith to contend for the mastery of the Black Sea, or to secure the Bosphorus and the approaches to his capital. Since the destruction of the janissaries in 1826, he had been busily occupied in forming an army disciplined in the European manner, and chiefly by European officers ; but that army was as yet but in embryo, or a promising nucleus, and in case of invasion he must still depend mainly upon an irregular cavalry, and a most irregular and undisciplined infantry. The czar knew his weakness, and also knew that if time were allowed to Sultan Mahmoud this weakness might be changed into strength. Nicholas, therefore, disengaging himself from the treaty of London, or the triple alliance which Mr. Canning had framed for the salvation of the Greeks, de-



clared war against Turkey on his own account, or for objects which he said concerned Russia alone. "For sixty years," said the Ottoman Porte, "Russia has eagerly taken advantage of the slightest pretext for declaring war against us ; for sixty years she has been stirring up insurrection and revolt among the subjects of the sultan ; her intrigues have never ceased either during peace or during war ; and for sixty years she has been labouring to subvert the empire of the Osmanlee and occupy Constantinople." But remonstrances and criminations were fruitless. Turkey must fight or submit. Weak and distracted as she was, she fought gallantly ; and strong as were the Russians, they gained little military honour in the campaign of 1828. Troops had long been collecting in Bessarabia for the premeditated attack. By the 7th of May, an army of 115,000 men began its movements in three divisions, while Admiral Greig, with the Russian fleet, co-operated with it, and maintained the command of the Black Sea. A part of this army was soon across the Pruth. They besieged and reduced several fortresses, suffering great loss themselves in these operations, in some of which they must have failed entirely but for their fleet. In Anapa, at Brailow, the Turks made a most obstinate and gallant defence, and while they were maintaining those places, a great force, consisting of the sultan's regulars mixed with the irregulars, was accumulating at the foot or in the defile of the Balkan mountain—the Mount Hæmus of antiquity. The Russians showed themselves in front of that mountain, but they could not pass it until they had reduced the fortress and strongly fortified positions of Shoomla, where an old Pasha, the scourge of the janissaries, and the bold and sagacious reformer of the Turkish soldiery, had thrown himself with 40,000 men ; nor could Shoomla be successfully attacked unless the neighbouring seaport town of Varna were previously reduced. The Emperor Nicholas himself came up to press the siege of Varna, but he soon sailed back to Odessa. Varna had a strong garrison, and the *Osmanlees* cantoned between it and Shoomla were not *idle, but made numerous and resolute attempts to inter-*



rupt the besiegers. In one affair, the Russians were thoroughly beaten and driven from a great redoubt which they had made; and here fell General Wrede and every one of his officers. At the end of August, when the Russians had made no impression upon Varna, and when sickness, engendered partly by malaria and partly by the deficient and abominably bad provisions which the Russian commissariat dispensed to the troops, the army of the czar was reinforced from Russia, and the czar himself returned to the besieging army. The Russians had calculated that Varna could not hold out longer than a month. That ill-fortified place defied their reinforced army and their whole fleet for nearly three months, and then it was delivered up only through the treachery or base timidity of Meschid Pasha, the second in command. In their several assaults the Russians had been invariably defeated; their loss had been terrific; but at last, on the 11th of October, they entered within the undefended walls of Varna. Having achieved this conquest, and having garrisoned Varna, a retrograde movement was commenced to the Danube, and across the Danube, the Turks closely following the retiring columns, who abandoned a great part of their baggage in their retreat. In other directions the fortune of the Russians had been various, but nowhere had their success been very splendid. After more than a four months' siege they were compelled to make a very humiliating retreat from before the walls of Silistria. They left nearly all the horses of the army and nearly all their baggage behind them. General Gismar gained on the 26th of December the only thing like a victory in the field that adorned the campaign in the European provinces, defeating the Pasha of Widden at Czoroi. But in the Asiatic provinces General Paschievitch cleared his way to the vicinity of Erzeroum, by gaining several small battles, and by driving the sultan's forces out of four entrenched camps. Before declaring war against Turkey, Russia had very adroitly made a peace with Persia, with whom she had been at war. Thus General Paschievitch, who had commanded in the Persian war, and who was at hand with troops that had been accus-

tomed to Oriental warfare, had been left disengaged and in a good state of preparation at the commencement of the present struggle with the sultan.

In Portugal, the absolutists had again triumphed over the liberals. The British force which was dispatched by Mr. Canning to put down the interference of Spain, and for no other object, had easily and completely succeeded in its mission, and had preserved a discipline, and a discretion, and an abstinence from intermeddling between Portuguese and Portuguese, party and party, which must ever entitle those officers and soldiers to admiration. They were not there to prescribe to the Portuguese nation the form of government under which it must live: they were there to prevent another foreign country—Spain—from dictating to the Portuguese “constitution or no constitution.” Donna Maria or Dom Miguel was to them the same—was and ought to be the same—provided only it was the free choice of the pronounced and predominant majority of the Portuguese people. Mr. Canning had declared that he would neither be the critic nor the champion of Don Pedro’s constitution, and that he never meant in any way to dictate any constitution or form of government, however great his predilection might be for liberal institutions. If Mr. Canning had lived, his policy with regard to Portugal would have differed in no essential particular from that which was now pursued by the Duke of Wellington and his cabinet. To talk of a sudden and violent change in our own policy in this respect, is to betray an ignorance or an utter forgetfulness of the declarations made by Mr. Canning before he sent our troops to Portugal.

Dom Pedro, who was still in Brazil, and who never pursued a very wise or consistent line of conduct in this matter, had been induced to believe that his brother Dom Miguel had been improved in constitutionalism by travelling through, and residing in, the unconstitutional countries of Europe. Now the constitutionalism of that young prince signified very little: it was the mass of the people that required to be constitutionalized; it was the animosity of the clergy and monastic bodies that required to

be moderated. From first to last Dom Miguel was but an instrument in the hands of the absolutists and clergy. Dom Pedro, however, named his brother to the regency of Portugal. It is said that in so doing he flattered himself that he was adopting the most efficacious expedient to reconcile the two factions which divided Portugal. But those two factions were irreconcilable, and the giving a prince of the blood-royal to the absolutists was only making that faction so much the stronger; and in Portugal or in Spain never yet did the stronger party act with any moderation towards the weaker. It is said, too, that Dom Pedro was sustained by this pleasant belief—the regency would secure to the young prince all the real advantages of power during the minority of his niece, Donna Maria, and, as he was to become her husband so soon as she could assume the reins of government, he would remain quiet and contented, being secure of all the authority at which he could aim without the guilt of unnatural rebellion or usurpation. Those who were best acquainted with the character of Dom Miguel, the disposition of the Portuguese people, and the circumstances of the time, are still of opinion that the prince would really have remained quiet and contented if he had been able so to do. But he was not able. From the moment of his return to Portugal, he was carried along by a whirlwind of political passion, which had gained strength from its temporary suppression, and subsequently he was hurled along a cataract and involved in a vortex, much louder and angrier and more unavoidable than the Charybdis of Homer. The constitutionalists ought to have foreseen what would happen, but they concurred in the nomination of Miguel as regent. By accepting that office, they said he had acknowledged the rights of the monarch who bestowed it, and pledged himself to use it for the purposes for which it bore to have been granted—the maintenance of the charter, and the gradual advancement of constitutional freedom. Dom Miguel had written to his sister, hitherto regent, from Vienna, that he was “determined to maintain inviolate the laws of the kingdom, and the institutions legally granted by our august

brother, and cause them to be observed, and by them to govern the kingdom." Taking England in his way home, he reached London at the end of December, 1827. The Portuguese residents in our capital were very numerous, and, for the most, of the liberal party. They waited upon him with an address, and were much pleased with the answer and the manners of his royal highness. He dropped not a word that could be interpreted into an indication of ill-will against the charter or against the rights of his niece. It may be doubted whether at that time he had formed any fixed design whatsoever. But, even if he had spoken out against the constitution, it was not for the English government to undertake either his conversion or his punishment. England could neither put him in a prison nor prevent his going back to Portugal. As many persons afterwards talked and wrote, it might have been inferred that England had the right of doing both; and that she was bound to exact securities from the prince for his constitutionalism and for his scrupulous regard to the rights of his niece. But, in sober truth, we could ask no such securities in any way whatsoever. And what would have been the value of securities so exacted? England asked for none.

Dom Miguel remained in London till the middle of February, when he sailed for Portugal. On the 22nd of that month he arrived in the Tagus, to find, on the one hand, a distracted and discredited liberal ministry, and on the other, an army on the verge of mutiny, and an immense and most passionate party, who called upon him, as he loved his God, his church, and country, to put an end to the abominations which had been perpetrated by the liberals. The prince took the oath to the constitution, and then appointed a ministry decidedly hostile to it. Shouts rose and spread of "Long live Dom Miguel, our true and absolute king!" All business in Lisbon came to a dead stand; an immense mob perambulated the streets, making all those who went to visit the prince shout out *before they entered the palace for religion, holy church, and absolute king.* In a brief space of time all the constitutional officers were dismissed or withdrawn from their

commands, and their places were filled by officers of the ultra-absolutist party.

The time fixed for the departure of the British troops had now arrived. Our resident minister, Sir Frederick Lamb, detained them for a short time on his own responsibility; but the British government could not consider that those troops ought to be left to take part in a civil war, and orders were sent out for their immediate return. To show how weak the liberal party really was, it will suffice to say, that most of its leaders, giving up the cause as hopeless, embarked in the English ships, or quickly followed them, in order to seek once more an asylum in England. The palace was now daily crowded with petitions and petitioners, all hotly urging Dom Miguel to declare himself king in his own right and by the will of the nation. On the 3rd of May the prince issued a decree, convoking the cortes of Lamego, the ancient three estates of the kingdom, who had not been assembled since 1697. The decree was solemn, and to this effect:—
“The necessity of convoking the three estates of the kingdom, already acknowledged by the king, my father (now in glory), in his decree of June 4, 1824, having increased by reason of the late events, and I desiring to satisfy the urgent representations which the clergy, the nobility, the tribunals, and all the municipalities have submitted to my royal presence, have thought proper, in conformity with the opinion of learned persons, zealous for the service of God and the good of the nation, to convoke the said three estates of the kingdom in this city of Lisbon, within thirty days from this date of the letters of convocation, for the end that they, in a solemn and legal manner, according to the usages and style of this monarchy, and in the form practised on similar occasions, may recognise the application of grave points of Portuguese right, and in that way restore public concord and tranquillity, and that all the important business of the kingdom may take consistence and just direction. My council of ministers is to understand my order in this sense, and cause it to be executed.”

In the city of Oporto the liberal party proved the

stronger: the soldiers there stationed took new vows to be true to the constitution and to Donna Maria; they were joined by the garrisons of some other towns on the north bank of the Douro; and, after establishing a provisional government, they quitted Oporto to march upon Lisbon. They had among them no single officer of distinguished rank or high character. Their ablest generals were among the refugees in England. But letters were sent by the provisional government of Oporto to implore them to return immediately and put themselves at the head of this enterprise. The Marquess Palmella, the Count Villa Flor, the Count Taipa, General Saldanha, General Xavier, and some others, sailed from Plymouth for Portugal in the month of June. Meanwhile, the troops of the provisional junta of Oporto, amounting in all to about 6000 men, had entered Coimbra without opposition, had taken formal possession of that city, and had been joined by a portion of the students of its university. Instead of advancing rapidly upon the capital, they lingered about Coimbra during a month or five weeks, doing nothing, and providing for nothing. They were never roused from this inaction until the troops of Dom Miguel, in superior force, fell upon them in front and in flank. On the 24th of June there was what the Portuguese called a battle; and on the following day the constitutionalists began to retreat to Oporto. On the 26th, the generals from England joined the routed army, which, by this time, was reduced, by desertion and the influence of the priests and monks, to about 3000 men. Despairing of being able to maintain themselves in Oporto, where no preparations for defence had been made, these constitutional generals determined to make a run for it, and gain the Spanish frontier. The junta dissolved itself, and those who had formed it, and other individuals who did not intend to follow the fugitive army, embarked and sailed for England, whence the most distinguished of them had taken their departure only a few weeks before. The troops continued their retreat through the province of Minho. On their march they had several skirmishes with Miguelite corps; and, partly

through the bad state of the roads, they lost their artillery, their baggage, and nearly everything they carried with them. On the fourth day of their run they reached the frontier of Galicia in a very hungry and tattered condition. The Spaniards did not receive them with cordiality; but they were neither thrown into prison nor given up to the Miguelites, who were athirst for their blood. They were allowed to travel forward to Ferrol and Coruña, and thence they were conveyed to England. A depôt of these refugees was established at Plymouth.

At the commencement of this unlucky counter-revolution in Oporto, the Miguelites in Lisbon had seized every man they suspected of favouring the constitution, or, failing in arresting him, had caused him to fly the kingdom. When the army of Oporto was loitering at Coimbra, some 3000 individuals were clapped up in the prisons of the capital. But the advance of the constitutionalists to Coimbra had not prevented the assembling of the Three Estates. They assembled in Lisbon on the 23rd of June, the session being opened by a speech from the Bishop of Viseu. On the 26th, they voted unanimously and by acclamation that Dom Miguel was the only legal sovereign, that Dom Pedro had no right over the kingdom, and that every institution which he had introduced had been, and was, null and illegal; and on the 28th Dom Miguel, by an ordinance, confirmed this judgment, and assumed the style and title of King of Portugal and the Algarves. So soon as this was done, the ambassadors of all the states, except Spain and the States of the Pope, quitted Lisbon. One of the Dom's first regal acts was the appointment of a special commission, which was to traverse the kingdom, and punish at its discretion all those who had borne any share in the attempted counter-revolution of Oporto, or who had made themselves peculiarly obnoxious by their political opinions or former acts. A dreadful retaliation was now inflicted on the liberals.

On the 2nd of September, Dom Pedro's daughter, and once the destined bride of her uncle Miguel, arrived at Gibraltar from Brazil, in the intention of proceeding

up the Mediterranean to Genoa, whence she was to proceed overland to Vienna, there to remain a time with her grandfather the Emperor of Austria. But the intelligence received at Gibraltar of all that had happened in Portugal induced the officers who were with the young princess to take a very different course; and, instead of going up to Genoa, Donna Maria sailed back through the Straits and made for England. She landed at Falmouth on the 24th of September. She was received with royal honours, and with all the kindness which her years, her sex, and the peculiarity of her situation demanded. The English government, people, and king, all gave her warm welcome. Our diplomatic relations with her uncle Dom Miguel remained of course suspended.

During the summer and autumn of this year the Roman Catholics of Ireland took bolder and longer strides than they had hitherto done. They adopted intimidation as their best working principle. They would extort from the fears of government that which they said they could not obtain from its justice. The priests were uncommonly active. "They passed from the theological to the political arena, harangued at aggregate and other Catholic meetings, and were soon both the priests and the tribunes of the people."* Their influence over elections was immense, and was exercised without any regard to truth or fairness, without any scruple whatever. The reluctant, ignorant voter they could terrify with the hint or threat of excommunication, purgatory, eternal damnation. Mr. Vesey Fitzgerald, who had vacated his seat for Clare by taking a place in the Duke of Wellington's cabinet, reappeared on the hustings of his native county. He had long been an advocate of the Catholic claims, his very enemies could not deny the excellency and amiability of his personal character, he had the local influence of family and fortune, and the support of the gentry of Clare; but because he was a member of the Wellington ministry, the priests and the Catholic Association, and

* Wallace—'Memoirs of the Life and Reign of George IV.'

their blind devotees the peasants, not only drove him from the field before the close of the second day, but substituted in his place the disqualified Catholic agitator, Mr. Daniel O'Connell. It was quite certain that, as the law stood, Mr. O'Connell could not be admitted to sit and vote in the House of Commons; but still his return was considered as a master-stroke of party policy. In the words of a writer who cannot see that the Irish Catholics were ever wrong or English statesmen ever right in these affairs—"It was such an appalling manifestation of Catholic determination and force as no anti-Catholic minister would venture to encounter on a general election." *

A plan was formed, and was soon executed with the aid and agency of the priests, to sever the ties between the Catholic forty-shilling freeholders and their landlords. They also framed and promulgated certain tests. Every candidate for parliament must pledge himself to an uncompromising opposition to the Wellington ministry so long as emancipation was resisted. Mr. Sheil, the best educated of the agitators, delivered many startling speeches, which were printed in the newspapers, as well in England and Scotland as in Ireland. He, too, relied upon the effects of intimidation. His motto, like Danton's, was "*Faire Peur.*" In one of these speeches he said:—"Does not a tremendous organization extend over the whole of Ireland? Have not all the natural bonds by which men are tied together been broken and burst asunder? Are not all the relations of society which exist elsewhere gone? Has not property lost its influence? Has not rank been stripped of the respect which should belong to it? *and has not an internal government grown up which, gradually superseding the legitimate authorities, has armed itself with a complete domination?* Is it nothing that the whole body of the Catholic clergy are alienated from the state; and that the Catholic gentry and peasantry and priesthood are all combined in one vast confederacy? So much for Catholic

indignation while we are at peace; and when England shall be involved in a war—I pause. It is not necessary that I should discuss that branch of the subject, or point to the cloud which, charged with thunder, is hanging over our heads.”

With defiant proclamations like these, and with the Catholics ranked and marshalled in most hostile array before them, could the Irish Protestants remain silent, neutral spectators? It has been the greatest curse of that country that every set of opinions, in politics or in religion, has been carried up or down to the fanatical point. Protestantism was there as hot and uncompromising as Catholicism. The old Orangemen began to look to their swords and pistols. Protestant associations and Brunswick clubs were formed to organize a resistance to the associated Papists. If the English government and its troops had not been between these two furious parties, there would have been at once a war *à l'outrance*, and Ireland would have been deluged with blood. That the adherents of the Roman church would have been victorious in the end is not quite clear to any conception except that of an Irish Roman Catholic. True, in numbers the Papists more than trebled the Protestants; but look at the respective qualities of the men; look at them physically and morally; look at the education, property, wealth, and general intelligence of the Scotch and English descended Protestants, and then let the eye rest for a moment upon the ignorance, the proneness to blundering, and the squalid poverty of the great body of the Papists! Heaven forefend that these parties should be left to themselves to try that stern contest; but one good way of preventing it may be to impress on the minds of the Roman Catholic peasantry, that mere numbers do not give victory, and that the final result of such a contest would be for them very doubtful.

Even in England the tumultuary proceedings of the Irish Catholics created a great ferment. The opponents of emancipation, fearing that government was about to yield to the organized power of the Papists, thought it right to call for a public expression of the opinion of

Englishmen. The example was set by the county of Kent. In pursuance of a requisition signed by many persons of rank and influence in the county, a meeting of the freeholders and yeomanry was held on Pennenden Heath, on the 24th of October. It was the most numerous public meeting that had assembled in England for many years: 20,000 persons met on that broad heath with leaders and speakers very different from the noisy demagogues who had presided over the meetings for parliamentary reform, with universal suffrage, and vote by ballot. These leaders and speakers might be somewhat intolerant in matters of faith, or somewhat too much afraid of the effects which would follow the granting of any more concessions to the intolerant church of Rome; but they were gentlemen of character and fortune—men respected throughout the country, and certainly men who had a right to express freely their opinion on this vital subject. Orator Hunt, whose popularity had greatly declined since the day of Petersfield, endeavoured to thrust himself in, but he was not allowed a hearing. Nor was Mr. Cobbett more successful in the same experiment. The Earl of Winchelsea, and Sir Edward Knatchbull, one of the members for the county, supported the petition proposed for the adoption of the meeting. It was moderate in expression. These were its words:—"To the Honourable the House of Commons, the humble Petition of the undersigned Freeholders of the county of Kent.

"That your petitioners beg leave to express to your honourable house their sense of the blessings they enjoy under the Protestant Constitution of these kingdoms, as settled at the Revolution.

"Viewing with the deepest regret the proceedings which have for a long time been carrying on in Ireland, your petitioners feel themselves imperatively called upon to declare their strong and inviolable attachment to those Protestant principles which have proved to be the best security for the civil and religious liberty of these kingdoms.

"*They therefore approach your honourable house*

humbly, but earnestly, praying that the Protestant Constitution of the United Kingdom may be preserved entire and inviolable."

No counter-motion was made which directly favoured the demands of the Catholics; but it was moved, that it ought to be left entirely to his majesty's government to propose such measures as they might think proper for the pacification of Ireland, and the general benefit of the kingdom. This motion was supported by Earl Camden, Earl Darnley, the Earl of Radnor, and Lord Teynham; but the petition was carried by a great majority.

The English friends of emancipation were very severe in their censure of the Pennenden Heath meeting, talking about the wickedness of attempting to control government by such meetings and votes. It has been justly said that had the meeting terminated the other way, these very men would have applauded it as a magnificent and temperate display of constitutional action. "Was the question, whether Catholics should be admitted to political power, one on which ministers alone were fitted and qualified to decide? Assuredly not. It involved the weightiest interests of every man in the kingdom: its Protestant opponents held that the constitution itself was at stake. If ever there was a doubtful topic on which every part of the people was bound and entitled to make its voice be heard, it was that which had been submitted to the freeholders of Kent."*

We are advocates of religious liberty, and friends to the emancipation which was now merely preparing; but we would be fair to all parties, and would not speak with disrespect of the scruples and fears of honest men. Our national pride, too, is revolted by any notion of yielding to threats and intimidation; and, friends of emancipation as we are, we object strongly, and ever shall do so, to many of the means by which that measure was forced through parliament, and down the throats of the English people.

The example of Pennenden Heath was followed in

* Annual Register for 1828.

some other parts of England. Brunswick or constitutional clubs rose up in Leeds, in Leicester, and, under the patronage of the Marquess of Chandos, in the county of Buckingham. But they displayed no activity; they neither salaried nor in any other way cherished "agitators;" they were moderate and prosy, and they left scarcely a trace behind them.

The Catholic question still continued an open question in the cabinet. Mr. Dawson, the member for Derry, secretary to the treasury, and brother-in-law to Mr. Peel, had hitherto been a zealous anti-Catholic; but now, at a public dinner to his constituents, he declared that he had come to the conclusion that emancipation was the only means of restoring the supremacy of government and law in Ireland. In a correspondence with Dr. Curtis, the Catholic primate of that country, the Duke of Wellington said that he was most anxious to witness the settlement of the Catholic question, and if it could be buried in oblivion, for *a short time*, he would not despair of seeing a satisfactory result. On the other hand, the Marquess of Anglesey, the present lord-lieutenant, was of opinion that it was neither possible nor desirable to bury the question, though for ever so short a time. The noble marquess—the gallant soldier, and perfect English gentleman—gave the Irish Catholics and their agitators advice much too gentle and good to be taken by them. He told them, that though they might persevere in their cause, they ought to abstain from using personal and offensive language towards those who opposed their claims. "Personality," said the marquess, "offers no advantage; it effects no good; on the contrary, it offends and confirms predisposed aversion. Let the Catholic trust to the justice of his cause, and to the growing liberality of mankind." This was said during the month of December. In the beginning of January the Marquess of Anglesey was recalled, to be succeeded by the Duke of Northumberland.

A.D. 1829.—Parliament was opened by commission on the 5th of February, with a speech which contained *a decisive recommendation* from the throne:—"The

state of Ireland has been the object of his majesty's continued solicitude. His majesty laments, that in that part of the United Kingdom an association should still exist, which is dangerous to the public peace, and inconsistent with the spirit of the constitution, which keeps alive discord and ill-will amongst his majesty's subjects; and which must, if permitted to continue, effectually obstruct every effort permanently to improve the condition of Ireland. His majesty confidently relies on the wisdom and on the support of his parliament, and his majesty feels assured that you will commit to him such powers as may enable his majesty to maintain his just authority. His majesty recommends, that when this essential object shall have been accomplished, you should take into your deliberate consideration the whole condition of Ireland, and that you should review the laws which impose civil disabilities on his majesty's Roman Catholic subjects. You will consider whether the removal of those disabilities can be effected consistently with the full and permanent security of our establishments in church and state, with the maintenance of the reformed religion established by law, and of the rights and privileges of the bishops and of the clergy of this realm, and of the churches committed to their charge."

Generally, those who were opposed to emancipation charged the Duke of Wellington with an unfair concealment of his design up to the last hour, and taxed Mr. Peel with faithlessness and apostacy. They said, that had the Duke of Wellington disclosed his intentions sooner, the petitions of the people and the counsel of individuals would have fortified the king's well-known opposition to the measure. The duke vindicated himself by the fact of his not having obtained the king's sanction until near the last moment. Indeed, down to the afternoon of the 10th of February, when the ministerial plan was to be introduced into the Commons, the Duke of Wellington did not feel perfectly secure. It was said, that down to *the very last hour*, it was really a matter of doubt with *Mr. Peel* whether he should proceed; and that this *doubt* was removed by the duke writing him a hurried

pencil note, containing the words—"You may go on." Mr. Peel went on, beginning by introducing a bill to suppress the Catholic Association, as a measure which ought to precede any consideration of the claims of the Catholics.

In the course of the discussions, it was strongly pressed upon ministers, why the suppression of this association had not been sooner accomplished? You justly describe this association, it was said to them, as a body whose existence is incompatible with the due operation of the powers of the regular government. You represent Ireland as being in a state of agitation, which can be soothed only by granting all that the Catholics demand; and no man can doubt that the Catholic Association, which exists only for purposes of agitation, is the great fomentor of that dangerous and alarming spirit. You say that it must be put down; you ask extraordinary powers to put it down; by doing so, you grant that it may be put down. If so, why has it been allowed to go on prospering and unimpeded for years, till, having gained "a giant's stature and a tyrant's strength," it brings you crouching to its feet in trembling obedience to its mandates? In short, you acknowledge, that by a due use of power you might have prevented the state of things in which, now that it has been allowed to grow up, you seek an apology for deserting the policy to which you have been so long pledged. Above all, you asked and obtained, in 1825, an act for suppressing this very association. Yet it is since that time that it has become so formidable. If the powers given by that act were sufficient, why was it not enforced? If they were insufficient, why were more effective powers not demanded? for who would have grudged any powers necessary to put down an usurpation of the regular government of the country?

The solicitor-general for Ireland answered, that he had attended to the debates of the association with the closest anxiety; but, after all his anxiety and all his vigilance, it was the unanimous opinion of his colleagues *on the other side of the Channel*, that it would have

been a useless task to have undertaken a prosecution against any individual for his conduct in the Catholic Association, and that an abortive attempt at prosecution would have been worse than useless, inasmuch as it would have irritated, without putting down, the members of that association. He could not, upon the present occasion, enter into a detail of all the circumstances, which in his opinion, rendered it impolitic to attack the Catholic Association—he would confine himself to saying, that it was a matter of extreme difficulty to draw up a bill of indictment against 7,000,000 of people. He did believe, that baffled and hampered as the legal advisers of the crown were, the wisest plan which they could pursue was to confess the real truth, that it was a matter of extreme difficulty to frame such an indictment. He had voted for the bill of 1825; but since that time there had been a new parliament, and it was by no means certain that the present parliament would repose the same confidence in, or intrust similar powers to, a ministry, unless some hopes were held out that the coercive measure was to be immediately followed by one of concession. The solicitor-general, however, forgot that this very House of Commons had refused, in 1827, to entertain Sir Francis Burdett's motion for a committee.

Mr. Huskisson said, that it would have been impossible, in the way of definition and enactment, to have gone further than the act of 1825 went, without interfering improperly with the rights and privileges of the subject generally; and from the period in which that act was passed, down to the period in which he ceased to have a share in his majesty's councils, the government had been most anxious to give full efficacy, as far as was consistent with the liberty of the subject, to such provisions of it as were intended to guard against the mischief of the Catholic Association. When he saw the mode in which that act was evaded in Ireland, his mind was made up to *this conclusion*—that there was no mode of terminating *the danger arising* from that association without vesting *in the government* a considerable portion of arbitrary

power—indeed such a portion as it was now proposed to vest for a time in the government of Ireland. Now he would ask whether the House was prepared to place such power in the Irish government permanently? He was not at liberty to state to the House what passed in his majesty's councils during the period in which he had the honour of enjoying a seat at the council board—neither was it necessary that he should do so: he was at liberty, however, to state this—that, having come to the conclusion which he had just declared to the House, he could not help coming to another conclusion also; and that was, that, consistently with his public duty, he could not grant to the government that arbitrary power which was necessary to put down the Catholic Association, without putting an end, at the same time, to the cruel system of exclusion which called that association into existence. Either in or out of office, he never would have agreed to such a measure of coercion, if assured it was to be a permanent measure, unless it had been accompanied at the same time by an assurance that the evil system, which the association sought to remedy, was going to be abandoned.

Mr. Peel said, that to state the reasons why he did not enforce the act of 1825, would make it necessary to go into the whole history of affairs in Ireland during the last four years, which would lead to the conclusion that, amid the divisions and contentions which prevailed, the real abatement of faction was impossible. Moreover, it should be borne in mind how the act of 1825 was followed up by the same parliament which introduced it. It had been followed up by a bill for Catholic relief, which though lost in the Upper House, must yet have shown the people that conciliation was intended to accompany coercion. The act, then, of 1825, was not the only measure upon which the House of Commons depended for the tranquillity of Ireland, when they had recorded its accompaniment by the admission that Catholic disabilities ought to be removed. These were the causes which had prevented the effectual operation of the law of 1825,

The act passed: but the association rendered it unnecessary to make use of the powers which it bestowed. Their parliamentary friends had pointed out to them, that, as matters stood, with the government pledged to emancipation, their continuing together as a body could only do mischief; and the association, even before the bill had completed its hasty progress, declared itself dissolved. It was plain, however, even from the explanations given by ministers themselves, that the association had been allowed to bully the government into submission, and that the present act for its suppression was mere legislative mockery—the ridiculous assumption of a threatening gesture to cover and conceal their impotence. The association had demanded emancipation, unqualified emancipation, and nothing else. It had said to the government, Give us emancipation, and we exist no more; refuse us what we ask, and we defy your power either to restrain or to resist us. The question between it and the government had never been, whether it would be quiet, if the government gave all that it demanded—but whether or no the government could compel it to be quiet, even though it should get nothing. In such circumstances, when one hand held a bill for suppressing the association, while the other contained a bill granting all that the association demanded, to speak of having suppressed the association was an abuse of words. It was as if a man should boast of his victory over a highwayman, to whom he exclaims, when the pistol is at his breast, “Down with your pistol, sir, for there are my purse and my watch.”*

The new bill against the Association received the royal assent on the 5th of March; and on the same day Mr. Peel moved in the House of Commons, that the House should go into a committee on the laws which imposed disabilities on the Catholics. But he no longer rose as member for the University of Oxford. On the 4th of February, the day before the meeting of parliament, he addressed a letter to the vice-chancellor of

* Annual Register for 1829.

the university, announcing the new views of policy by which he was about to be guided, acknowledging that his resistance to the Catholic claims had been one main ground on which the university had made him its representative, and tendering his resignation. His resignation was accepted; Mr. Peel vacated his seat, and was immediately proposed as a candidate at the new election. His opponent was Sir Robert Harry Inglis, who had not yet seen the expediency of changing his opinions. Never were greater exertions made in the course of any election. The united influence of the government and of the Whigs was pushed to its utmost limit in behalf of the home secretary. On the other hand, Sir Robert H. Inglis was supported by some of the dignitaries of the church, and, with great zeal, by the parochial clergy. After a contest of three days, during which 1364 voters polled, Oxford rejected Mr. Peel by a majority of 146. He was immediately returned for the borough of Westbury.

On the 5th of March, for which day a call of the House had been ordered, Mr. Peel, having made his motion, began a long speech with stating, that he rose, as a minister of the king, to vindicate the advice which an united cabinet had given to his majesty, to recommend to the consideration of parliament the condition of the Catholics, and to submit to the House those measures by which government proposed to carry that recommendation into effect. He was aware that the subject was surrounded by many difficulties, which were increased by the relation in which he himself stood to the question; but having come to the sincere conviction that the time was arrived at which an amicable adjustment of the disputed claims would be accompanied with less danger than any other course which he could suggest, on that conviction he was prepared to act, unchanged by any expression of opinion of an opposite nature, however general or deep—unchanged by the forfeiture of political confidence, or by the heavy loss of private friendship. He had long felt that, with a House of Commons favourable to emancipation, his position as

a minister opposed to it was untenable. Under this feeling, when a bill passed the House in 1825, he had intimated to Lord Liverpool his wish to resign, that he might thereby remove one obstacle to the settlement of the question. His resignation, he was informed, would occasion that of Lord Liverpool, and dissolve the ministry: he had agreed, therefore, to wait the decision of a new House of Commons. The new House of Commons, elected in 1826, decided in 1827 against the Catholics; but in 1828 it adopted a different course, and came to a resolution determining the principle of the question. After that decision he was prepared to follow the course which he had proposed to himself after the decision of 1825, with this addition—that he notified to the Duke of Wellington, not only his readiness to retire from office, but that, seeing the current of public opinion, he was ready to sacrifice consistency and friendship: and, by whatever parties the settlement of the question was undertaken, he, for one, was prepared, in whatever post he might be, to support the measure, provided he thought it was undertaken on principles safe for the Protestant establishment. He was aware that he was called on to make out a case for this change of policy: and he was now to submit to the House an argument of fact which proved to his mind, with the force of demonstration, that it was imperative on ministers to recommend the measure which he was about to introduce, however inconsistent it might seem to be with their former tenets.

Mr. Peel, in the next place, proceeded to explain the nature of the measure which he and his colleagues had resolved to propose as that which ought finally to adjust and settle the question. No persons, he said, except the members of government, had been parties to the framing of the bill. It had been thought advisable that it should not be proposed as a compromise or compact with any parties whatever; and that for its concessions as well as for its restrictions government alone should be responsible. *The principle and basis of the measure was to be the abolition of civil distinctions and the equality of*

political rights. There would be exceptions standing on special grounds, but such was to be the general rule. Another pervading principle of the bill would be the maintenance, in fact and in word, of the Protestant religion as by law established, its doctrines, its discipline, and its government. He would first of all repeal those laws which placed Catholics, unless they took certain oaths, on a different footing from Protestants, even in regard to real property, a distinction which Protestants and Catholics were equally interested in abolishing; the next provision would be the admission of Catholics to parliament, on the same terms with Protestants. Unless this was granted, all other concessions of political power would avail nothing. It had been proposed to restrict the number of Catholic members, and to define certain subjects on which they should not be allowed to vote: both of these limitations ministers had rejected. Any limitation of their numbers it would be difficult to carry into effect; and even if it were practicable, it would have the mischievous effect of making them combine, and holding them up as a sacred band charged with the interests of the Roman Catholics. There could be no efficient test for deciding on what questions a Roman Catholic member should be entitled to vote, and on what he should not. It would be difficult to determine what questions relate exclusively to the interests of the established church; and it might be that questions nominally relating to the interests of the established church might not be those in which its interests were really involved. If the Roman Catholic were entitled to speak, but precluded from voting on such questions, injury might be inflicted as effectually by an able man, with party ties and connexions, making an inflammatory speech, and then leaving his party to support it by their votes; yes, as much mischief might be inflicted by such a man, if he spoke, as if he were entitled to vote. On the whole, such a restriction would be a departure from the principle of the bill, viz., the abolition of all distinctions, and the equality of political rights. In conformity with the *same principle*, the bill would proceed, as a matter of

course, to render Catholics admissible to all corporate offices in Ireland, to all offices connected with the administration of justice, and to all the higher civil offices of the state. He was aware, he said, of the objections as to the last; but having once resolved to yield political power, this could not be refused. He doubted the wisdom of qualifying the Roman Catholic to receive a favour from the popular branch of the constitution, and leaving him disqualified to receive a favour from the crown; of allowing him to acquire distinction by flattering the prejudices and courting the applause of the people, and depriving the crown of the power to reward him for any exertions which he might make in support of its honour and dignity. In order to leave the avenues of ambition in parliament open to the Roman Catholic, he was of opinion that we ought to render him capable of being employed in the civil service of his country. It necessarily followed, from these concessions, that the oaths taken by members of the legislature must be modified. In the new oath the Catholic member would be called on to swear allegiance in the usual terms—to disclaim the deposing power of the pope, and the doctrine that his holiness had any temporal or civil power, directly or indirectly, within the realm—solemnly to abjure any intention of subverting the establishment, and to bind himself not to employ any of his privileges to weaken the Protestant religion or government. No doubt there was no disclaimer of certain other doctrines—the doctrine that faith was not to be kept with heretics—the doctrine that persons could be relieved by the pope from the solemn obligations of an oath. But to require them to make those and other disclaimers of a similar character was, in his opinion, an unnecessary piece of legislation. He had omitted them as unnecessary to be applied to those who were thought worthy to be incorporated into that House. The remaining part of the measure regarded the exceptions from the general rule—the securities which were to be retained in the midst of concession, as the safeguards of the Protestant constitution. These lay within a narrow compass, and related

to duties or offices connected with the established church. The only offices from which Mr. Peel proposed to exclude Catholics, were those of lord-lieutenant or chief governor of Ireland, and of lord high chancellor, or keeper, or commissioner of the great seal. He also meant to exclude Catholics from appointments in any of the universities, or colleges, or institutions upon Protestant foundations, such as Eton, Westminster, Winchester, or any ecclesiastical schools of the same kind; in addition to which he meant to retain the law against even presentations by Catholics to places of this kind; and he proposed farther, that in case a Catholic, by virtue of his situation or property, should hold any office of church patronage, such influence should be attached to and exclusively vested in the crown. He further proposed that it should not be lawful for any Catholic to advise the crown regarding the investiture or distribution of any ecclesiastical dignity in the established church of England or Ireland. Of other ecclesiastical securities, as they were called, which had at different times been proposed, he entirely disapproved. One proposal had been to provide for the Roman Catholic church, and incorporate it with the state; but this would require negotiation and compact with the see of Rome, and he saw the greatest difficulties at arriving at any such result. There was something revolting to the feelings of Englishmen, to the independence and pride of the country, in the King of England being obliged to go to a foreign ecclesiastical court like that of Rome, for the purpose of obtaining securities and determining on what footing his own subjects were to stand. They could not approach the court of Rome on such a subject without admitting it at once as an authority in legislation, and recognising its right to withhold its assent from the measure. On that ground he took it that negotiations of this nature with the court of Rome were incompatible with the dignity, the character, and the independence of England; and this was a sufficient objection to that mode of attempting to provide securities for the Protestant establishment in *church and state*. Moreover, the incorporation of the

Roman Catholic church with the state, the granting to the crown a control over the appointment of the Roman Catholic clergy, and the payment of salaries by the state to the ministers of that religion, would be a measure more repugnant to the feelings and principles of the inhabitants of this country than any other measure that could be devised.

A veto on the nomination of the Catholic bishops was another security which had been contained in former proposed bills ; but that, too, he would give up. His objection to it was, that it would be considered, and that not unjustly, as the commencement of a qualified establishment with regard to the Roman Catholic church. He objected to it, not that he thought this an unreasonable demand on the part of the crown, but because he thought that if we had sent to us a list of the names of candidates for the dignity of Catholic bishops in Ireland, it would be extremely difficult to free ourselves from the responsibility that must attach to our choice. We, in fact, would thus be parties to the nomination of Roman Catholic bishops, and would commence a qualified establishment for that church, which above all things, under existing circumstances, it was desirable to avoid. At once, then, he abandoned the idea of a veto,—first, because it afforded no rational security ; and, in the second place, because objections might possibly be made by the Roman Catholics towards our exercise of such a power, which objections it was not worth while to raise. Still less was he inclined to adopt a third security, viz., a power of examining the intercourse between the Irish Catholic church and the see of Rome. He did not know whether the Catholics would object to such a provision : but he had no desire to inspect the correspondence, and therefore no wish to raise the question. He would much rather that the secretary of state should have no more to do in the way of interference with the spiritual affairs of the Romish church than he had to do with the *internal discipline* and regulation of the Wesleyan Methodists. *If the time should arrive when, from a change of circumstances, danger was likely to result from that intercourse*

(civil or spiritual) after the settlement of the present question, he should have no hesitation in coming down to the House with a bill, regulating, and, if necessary, interdicting that correspondence. The great advantage of settling this question and composing the differences at present existing in Ireland, in consequence of the civil disabilities imposed on the Catholics, consisted in this,—that, after we had set this matter at rest, we should be enabled to demand and to take any securities that might be necessary. We should then be enabled to maintain a high, independent, and uncompromising tone towards the Roman Catholics of Ireland, and legislate for them as for others of his majesty's subjects.

But, though he discarded all these arrangements as sources of security, there were certain other things which it would be proper to make matter of regulation. In the first place, he thought it fit to provide that, when Roman Catholics were admitted to the enjoyment of corporate offices, and other offices of a similar nature, in no case, and under no pretence whatsoever, should the insignia of office be taken to any other place of worship than a place of worship of the established church; that the robes of office should not be exhibited in any other place of public worship except the Protestant church; and that the insignia of office, if carried in any religious ceremony, should be carried in the ceremonies of that church alone. Secondly, a practice had been got up of late, calculated to afford great, and, he might add, just, offence to Protestants,—a practice of claiming and assuming on the part of Roman Catholic prelates the names and titles of dignitaries belonging to the church of England. He proposed to prohibit the assumption by members of the Roman Catholic church of episcopal titles and names made use of in the church of England. Thirdly, it was necessary to enact some regulations for monastic institutions. At present such societies were not interfered with; and with the existing communities he did not propose to interfere to any considerable extent. However, it was manifest that we ought to know *the numbers of these societies, and who were the mem-*

bers of them ; and with a view to obtain this information, government intended to make a provision for having the names and numbers of the individuals composing such communities registered. They would also require that communities bound by monastic vows should not be extended and multiplied in this country in future ; and it was meant to provide against the entrance into this country of a class of men against whom other countries had set their faces, and who hitherto, therefore, had resorted to this ; he meant the order of Jesuits. Other countries had taken precautions against them, and why should not we ? The state of the law, as now proposed to be established, would at least give to every party belonging to these religious orders and communities the full enjoyment of the rights which they enjoyed at present ; it would confirm the existing privileges on a registration of their names and numbers. We had a clear right to take measures of security and precaution against the entrance of other members of these orders into the country, and against the extension of religious communities professing no allegiance to any authority in this country, and being under the control of foreign superiors, resident, it might be, at the court of Rome

Such was the plan described by Mr. Peel as that which ministers meant to propose for the new settlement of the constitution ; such were the grounds on which he maintained that such a new settlement could no longer be postponed. A concomitant measure was the raising of the freehold qualification in Ireland. But although Mr. Peel developed at some length, in the course of his speech, the principles on which he called for the assent of parliament to the disfranchisement of the forty-shilling freeholders in return for the concessions to be granted, yet, as that measure was contained in a separate bill, which ran its own course, it seems better to reserve the discussions regarding it for their own place, merely observing that it was always held out as a change which *must accompany* the other important measure, whether *in success or defeat*. Ministers would not ask for it *unless emancipation* were granted ; and if emancipation

were granted, they would not dispense with it. "And now," continued Mr. Peel, concluding a speech which occupied more than four hours, "although I am not so sanguine as others in my expectations of the future, I have not the slightest hesitation in saying I fully believe that the adjustment of this question, in the manner proposed, will not only give much better and stronger securities to the Protestant interests and establishment than any other that the present state of things admit of, but will also avert evils and dangers impending and immediate. I know I might have taken a more popular and palatable course,—more popular with the individuals in concert with whom I long thought and acted—more palatable to the constituents whom I have lost; but I have consulted for the best for Protestant interests and Protestant establishments. This is my defence against the accusations I have endured—this is my consolation under the sacrifices I have made—this shall be my revenge. I trust that, by the means now proposed, the moral storm may be lulled into a calm, the waters of strife may subside, and the elements of discord be stilled and composed. But if these expectations shall be disappointed; if, unhappily, civil strife and contentions shall arise; if the differences existing between us do not spring out of artificial distinctions and unequal privileges, but if there be something in the Roman Catholic religion not to be contented with a participation of equal privileges, or with anything short of superiority, still I shall be content to make the trial. If the battle must be fought,—if the contest which we would now avoid cannot be averted by those means,—let the worst come to the worst, the battle will be fought for other objects, the contest will take place on other grounds. The contest then will be, not for an equality of civil rights, but for the predominance of an intolerant religion. If those more gloomy predictions shall be realized, and if our more favourable hopes shall not be justified by the result, we can fight that battle against the predominance of an intolerant religion more advantageously after this measure *shall have passed*, than we could do at present. We

shall then have the sympathy of other nations ; we shall have dissolved the great moral alliance that existed among the Roman Catholics ; we shall have with us those great and illustrious authorities that long supported this measure, and which will then be transferred to us, and ranged upon our side ; and I do not doubt that in that contest we shall be victorious, aided as we shall be by the unanimous feeling of all classes in this country, as demonstrated in the numerous petitions presented to this House, in which I find the best and most real securities for the maintenance of our Protestant constitution, —aided, I will add, by the union of orthodoxy and dissent ; by the assenting voice of Scotland ; and, if other aid be necessary, cheered by the sympathies of every free state, and by the wishes and prayers of every free man, in whatever clime, or under whatever form of government, he may live.”

The debate upon the motion for going into a committee was continued by adjournment upon the 6th of March. The principal supporters of the proposal were found among ministers and their converted adherents. The Whigs, satisfied with approving and lauding the ministry, did not take any leading share in the discussion. Lord Milton, Sir J. Newport, Mr. Brougham, and Sir F. Burdett, spoke, but left the task of justification to the introducers of the measure, to whom it was much more difficult than it would have been to themselves.*

In opposition to the motion, Mr. Banks, Sir Robert Inglis, who had succeeded Mr. Peel in the representation of Oxford, and Mr. Clinton, denied that any one, or all, of the grounds on which this new policy had been adopted by government, could be admitted as valid. The grounds stated by Mr. Peel had been the state of Ireland, the evils of a divided cabinet, the difficulty of managing a House of Commons which left him in a minority, and the mischiefs consequent upon a division between the two branches of the legislature. In regard *to the first*, the discord and agitation to be found in Ire-

* Annual Register, 1829.

land not only were no new features in the history of that country, but were not even the result of the penal laws, and would not disappear on the removal of civil disabilities. These evils had existed in Ireland, in one shape or another, as long as we had known it; and ministers were bound to show that the situation of Ireland was worse than it had been when they held themselves bound, in justice to the country, to resist concession. The opponents of emancipation were asked what other remedy they would propose for the mischiefs of the present state of things. It would be enough to say, that at all events a remedy was not to be sought in the overthrow of the Protestant constitution, an evil in comparison with which all others became as nothing. According to the account of ministers themselves, the Catholic Association had been a main instrument in producing that disease for which they could now discover no cure but concession. But confessedly at the same time, not even an attempt had been made to crush that usurping convention. Acts had been passed for that purpose; and the very ministers who had called for them had allowed them, when obtained, to remain inoperative. With respect to the argument founded on the divided state of the cabinet, why did not the Duke of Wellington and Mr. Peel, instead of changing their own course, rather attempt to make such of their colleagues as were friendly to concession accede to their views?—the rather, as the right honourable gentleman stated that his opinions of the danger of granting Catholic emancipation were unchanged. Surely he could not be fearful of being able to form a cabinet unanimous on the point of exclusion, and therefore should never have struck those colours under which there were no difficulties too great to surmount. As to the danger of a civil war unless the intended measures were acceded to, ministers had erred in not relying on the aid and force which they would have derived from public opinion, and the moral determination of the people of England. Besides, it was not a choice between civil war and concession, as far as the people of *Ireland* were concerned; but a far greater chance of a civil

war to-morrow, on the part of the Protestants of England, if the Catholics were admitted to the entire privileges of the constitution. At best, it was only postponing the evil day; and it was for the House to consider under what different circumstances the attack could be resisted now from those to which it would be possible to meet it when the Catholics possessed all the political immunities of the constitution. Unfortunately, the very manner in which the measure was brought forward provoked further attack. It was not the triumph of those who long espoused the cause gradually working their way by the power of opinion: it was the victory of force driving former enemies into desertion by intimidation. It told the agitators of Ireland that they were too strong for the government of Britain; that whatever they asked would be conceded, even to the giving up of the constitution, provided only it were asked with enough of clamour and confusion. Ministers themselves did not venture to represent this measure as an act of grace, but as one which had been forced upon them by imperious necessity, many of them still retaining their former opinions, and having their eyes open to all the evils likely to result from the course which they were pursuing. No rational man could expect that the Catholics and Catholic priesthood would remain satisfied even with what was now given. The re-establishment of their church was not only their interest, if they were true Catholics it was their sacred duty, an obligation far more holy than that of battling for a civil franchise, which, in truth, would be chiefly valuable only as an instrument by which to regain religious preponderance. Even the home secretary seemed to anticipate an ulterior struggle, which implied that he believed the Catholics to entertain ulterior objects; and it was inexplicable wisdom to prepare for a contest by clothing your enemy in new armour, and putting into his hands new weapons of offence.

The opponents of emancipation did not consider the *provisions*, which were called securities against the *danger of admitting Catholics to the civil, judicial, and military powers of the state* as sufficient, or as other than

ridiculous. Admission of Catholics to all places was the general rule of the bill; and the securities were to be found in the exception of two offices, all the power connected with which might be just as much employed by the influence of Catholics filling other offices to which no disqualification was attached. The lord chancellor was not to be a Catholic; but then the first lord of the treasury might be a Catholic, and so might all the rest of the cabinet ministers. It was the first lord of the treasury who recommended to the crown persons who were to act as bishops in the Protestant church. Was it to be expected that a Roman Catholic first lord of the treasury would make a proper use of this patronage? Mr. Peel had stated, that, if any office to which church patronage was attached, should happen to be filled by a Catholic, then that patronage was to be transferred to some other minister. But what did this mean? The first lord of the treasury was the individual who recommended to the crown the appointment of the higher dignitaries of the church, but the appointment did not rest in himself, and therefore it would seem that there was nothing to prevent the first lord of the treasury, being a Catholic, from recommending to the sovereign persons appointed to bishoprics; though the first lord of the treasury or the chancellor of the duchy of Lancaster, if Catholics, could not exert a direct influence which might belong to their offices in conferring minor church preferments. It was maintained, on the same side, that the Catholics, regarding all shades of Protestantism as an accursed heresy, would never cease in their endeavours to proselytize. Ministers themselves acknowledged there was this danger—why else did they say that the moment when they were granting nearly all that the Catholics desired, that still they were not willing to trust them without some restrictions? These restrictions showed that they did not consider them worthy of being trusted.

Different members urged the propriety of dissolving parliament. Mr. Estcourt, one of the members for the *University of Oxford*, denied that the present parliament

was qualified to settle the Catholic question. It had, he said, been elected in 1826, when the affairs of the country were under the guidance of that vigilant protector of the Protestant cause—the late Lord Liverpool. There was not then the same anxiety about the Catholic question, for the country had confidence in his lordship, and even in the right honourable home secretary (Mr. Peel) himself. He thought it incumbent on ministers to take the sense of the country by calling a new House of Commons before they ventured to introduce so extraordinary a measure as that of admitting the Catholics to parliament and to the offices of state.

The motion, on the other hand, was supported by Sir George Murray, the colonial secretary, by Mr. Grant, Mr. North, and Mr. Huskisson. They repeated and enforced the positions, that the pacification of Ireland was necessary to the safety of the empire, and that without emancipation that pacification could not be effected. We could not destroy one part of the people by rousing and inciting the other. Government could not ally itself with Orange clubs. Peace was not to be restored to Ireland by Protestant arms or by a thoroughly established Protestant ascendancy. It was the duty of government to protect the whole community, without distinction as to religions or sects; it was the duty of government to ensure to all the greatest degree of protection, and to give to the people whatsoever privilege they had a right to claim and enjoy. Mr. Peel replied to those who called for a dissolution. A dissolution of parliament, said he, means that the Catholic Association and the elective franchise are to be left as they now are. If parliament is to be dissolved, the Catholic Association *must* be left as it is; for the law officers of the crown have declared that the common law is altogether inadequate to suppress it; and, being so left, it will overturn the representation of Ireland.

On a division the motion was carried by a majority of 188, the numbers dividing being 348 against 160.

Petitions were now poured into the house from all *quarters*. Before the first reading of the bill there had

been presented 957 petitions against emancipation, and 357 in its favour. Among the anti-Catholics there were several sudden conversions which were not always thought to proceed from disinterested motives. Sir Thomas Lethbridge, one of the members for Somersetshire, had worried or wearied Mr. Canning in his last days by his incessant harangues against the Catholics and against those who favoured their claims; he had taxed that minister as an apostate to the Church of England, and, quite recently (only in the middle of January), he had attended a public meeting in Devonshire assembled to petition against farther concessions to the followers of the old religion, and he had then and there been the organ of obstinate and enthusiastic resistance to the ministerial scheme. Yet, in the beginning of March, this same Sir Thomas Lethbridge stood out and pronounced a recantation, and declared all at once, and with such solemnity as was in him, that the plan of ministers was wise, excellent, patriotic, perfect in all its parts. On the 17th of March, Mr. Peel moved the second reading of the bill. Sir Charles Wetherell, the attorney-general, who had refused to draw the bill, was still in office, but only waiting until his successor could be appointed. He censured the whole bill in the bitterest manner, and was not sparing of personalities in speaking of those who had framed it, or who were advocates for it. The bill, however, was read a second time by a majority of 173, the numbers dividing being 353 to 180. In committee an amendment was moved to include the place of prime minister among the offices which could not be filled by Catholics. After three days in committee, the bill came out as it went in; and on the 30th of March it was read a third time and passed by the Commons. On the very next day, Mr. Peel, with a very numerous escort, presented his bill at the bar of the Lords. It was read that evening for the first time, and without opposition. The Duke of Wellington, who was determined to admit of no delay, moved that it should be read a second time on the 2nd of April. Lord Bexley and the Earl of Malmesbury

opposed this motion, on the ground that such precipitate haste was unbecoming. The duke answered that the subject had been sufficiently discussed already, and that the public were exceedingly anxious to see it settled. Lord Holland justified his grace by referring to the haste with which the statutes about to be repealed had been originally passed; and the motion was soon carried without a division.

On the 2nd of April, the Duke of Wellington moved the second reading, hoping the house would believe him when he said, that the course which he had now adopted on this question had not been adopted without the fullest conviction that it was a sound and just one. After taking a review of the actual state of Ireland, and dwelling upon the extremities to which adverse factions, animated by bigotry and hereditary hatred, were likely to proceed, the duke said, "It has been my fortune, my lords, to have seen much of war—more than most men. I was constantly engaged in the active duties of the military profession from boyhood until I grew grey. My life has been passed in familiarity with scenes of death and human suffering. Unfortunately, I have been chiefly engaged in countries where the war was internal—where a civil war was maintained by conflicting factions. I must say, that, at any sacrifice, I would avoid every approach to the horrors of civil war. My lords, I would do all I could—I would run any risk—I would sacrifice my life, to prevent such a catastrophe! Nothing could be so disastrous to the country, nothing so destructive of its prosperity as civil war: nothing could take place that tended so completely to demoralize and degrade as such a conflict, in which the hand of neighbour is raised against neighbour—that of the father against the son, and of the son against the father—of the brother against the brother—of the servant against his master—a conflict which must end in confusion and destruction. If civil war be so bad, when occasioned by resistance to government—if such a collision is to be avoided by all means possible, how much more necessary is it to avoid a civil war in which, in

order to put down one portion, it would be necessary to arm and excite the other. I am quite sure there is no man that now hears me who would not shudder were such a proposition made to him; yet such must have been the result, had we attempted to terminate the state of things, to which I have referred, otherwise than by a measure of conciliation. In this view, then, merely, I think we are justified in the measure we have proposed to parliament."

The debate which followed was continued during three days, the 2nd, 3rd, and 4th of April. On the 6th of April the bill was read a second time, by 217 against 112. On the 7th and 8th it passed intact through the committee; on the 10th it was read a third time and passed; and on the 13th it received the royal assent. Every one will understand that but for the energy and decision of the Duke of Wellington, this full emancipation, even now, could not have been carried.

Mr. Peel had brought in his bill to disfranchise the Irish 40s. freeholders, and raise the qualification to 10l. It was part of the general measure recommended from the throne, and it passed with little opposition through both houses. Mr. O'Connell, who had publicly bound himself to reject even emancipation if coupled with this disfranchisement, became silent, and acquiesced. The Catholic Association had ceased to exist, and being left to themselves, the Irish "Forties" were indifferent to the measure.

On the 13th of May, Mr. O'Connell presented himself to take his seat for Clare. The clerk produced the old oath, which the recent relief bill had repealed. Mr. O'Connell proposed to take the new oath prescribed by that bill; but he was informed by the Speaker that his return had been made before the passing of that act, and that he was therefore excluded from its operation. Mr. O'Connell was heard at the bar in support of his pretended right, which, after a good deal of discussion, was negatived by 190 against 116. The chief agitator then went back to Ireland, and was re-elected without *opposition for Clare.*

Parliament was prorogued by commission on the 24th of June. The closing speech announced that the war in the east of Europe between Russia and Turkey still continued; that England had renewed her friendly diplomatic relations with the Ottoman Porte; that the King of France had withdrawn his army from the Morea, with the exception of a small force, destined for a time to assist in the establishment of order in a country which had so long been the scene of confusion and anarchy; that the ambassadors of England and France had returned to Constantinople; and that, as the Emperor of Russia had been pleased to authorise the plenipotentiaries of his allies to act on behalf of his imperial majesty, the negotiations for the final pacification of Greece would be carried on in the name of the three contracting parties to the treaty of London.

Sir Charles Wetherell was succeeded by Sir James Scarlett, who had been attorney-general under the administration of Mr. Canning; and Mr. Sugden was appointed solicitor-general in the room of Sir Nicholas Tindal, now made chief justice of the Common Pleas.

All the discontents of Ireland were to end with emancipation. Thousands of times had it been said, only grant the Irish Catholics that boon, and they will be as quiet and as observant of the laws as the people of England and Scotland. The extent of Irish gratitude would be equal to the amount of the benefit conferred. But, alas! these were but fanciful predictions. The relief bill was carried in April, and in May Ireland seemed as turbulent as ever. By letters, and by speeches at aggregate meetings, Mr. O'Connell kept up the excitement. He told the Irish people that they had themselves achieved the religious liberty of their country; that they, "a sober, a moral, and a religious people," had become too strong for their oppressors; and that their progress towards prosperity was in vain opposed by the Peels and Wellingtons of society. He spoke *with reverence* of the monastic orders, and with horror *of a design, which he said was entertained by ministers for the suppression of those orders in Ireland.* With

his pockets well filled with "rent," he deplored the poverty of the Papists, and held out the wealth of the Protestants as a tempting bait. He gave nicknames of the most degrading kind to the leaders of the Brunswick clubs, and to every man who presumed to oppose him. He daringly and undisguisedly announced that emancipation was not all he wanted—that his great object now was to force on a *repeal of the union with England*. That union, he said, had converted Ireland into a province:—"That cursed measure had deprived Ireland of her senate, and thereby made her dependant upon British aristocracy, and British intrigue, and British interests. It could be repealed—it must be repealed. He would never cease to agitate until it was repealed." All this, and a great deal more, incensed and roused the Irish Protestants. Fierce conflicts took place in various parts of the island, and many lives were lost. In the county of Tipperary, matters went to such a length, that a numerous meeting of the magistracy assembled in the beginning of September, expressed a unanimous opinion that nothing but a revival of the insurrection act could restore or secure the peace of the country. This meeting was not made up of Orangemen; the greater number had nothing to do with Orange or with Brunswick clubs, and Lord Llandaff, the chairman, had been a strenuous supporter of emancipation. In the resolutions which they adopted, to be communicated to government, they affirmed that a large proportion of the community were in possession of arms, that bodies of armed men appeared at noon-day, to obstruct the execution of the laws, and threaten the lives and properties of all who attempted to resist their illegal proceedings—that it was impossible to obtain information to convict the offenders, owing to a league of false honour, and to a system of terror, which served the same purpose, by the dread of a violent death. The insurrection act could not be revived; for it had not been suspended, but had expired, and parliament was not sitting.

The Russians renewed their attack upon Turkey early in the year. Count Wittgenstein, who had gathered no

laurels the preceding year, was succeeded by General Count Diebitsch, an energetic commander. As before, the fleet co-operated with the army, and the Turks had no adequate force to oppose it. In April and May several sanguinary actions took place. On the 11th of June, Diebitsch succeeded in throwing himself in the rear of the army of the Grand Vizier, and in completely cutting off that army from all access to Shoomla, the great bulwark of the Balkan. Another battle was fought, and the loss on both sides was very great. While victory was yet doubtful, some of the Turkish ammunition wag-gons blew up, and caused disorder and a retreat. But, after all, the Grand Vizier opened the road to Shoomla, and got into that place. Two or three days after this, Count Diebitsch offered the vizier negotiations for peace. The vizier was not authorised to treat. Silistria was reduced by the Russians at the end of June, after a siege of six weeks, and the loss of 1200 men in killed and wounded. Being reinforced by this besieging army, Diebitsch resolved to press forward. Instead of undertaking the doubtful enterprise of reducing Shoomla, he stationed a force to watch that place, and striking to the right of it, he with the main body of the army passed the Balkan, and descended into the plains of Adrianople. He had some hard fighting before his eyes were gladdened with the sight; but on the 19th of August he came within view of Adrianople, the second city of the Turkish empire in Europe, and he entered therein on the 20th, without firing a shot.

Simultaneously with these movements, General Count Paskievitch was carrying everything before him in the Asiatic provinces, and was driving the remnants of the Turkish armies there into Trebizond.

The Sultan had no army to place between Adrianople and Constantinople. His pride at last gave way, and he sent two Turkish plenipotentiaries with powers to treat with Diebitsch. They arrived at Adrianople on the 27th of August, and at their request, the Russian general agreed to a suspension of hostilities. The treaty of peace was definitively signed on the 14th of Sep-

tember. By this treaty Russia restored to the Porte the principalities of Moldavia and Wallachia, and all the fortresses which she had occupied during the war. The Pruth was to continue to be the boundary between the two empires in Europe, from the point where it touches the territory of Moldavia to its junction with the Danube; but from the latter point to the mouth of St. George, the right bank of the Danube was to be the boundary, all the islands formed by the different branches of the river being declared to belong to Russia. In Asia, the captured Pashaliks of Kars, Bayzid, and Erzeroum, with part of that of Akhalzik, were restored to Turkey; but a new frontier-line was fixed in that direction, which left to Russia the town and fortress of Akhalzik, with the rest of the Pashalik of that name. It was stipulated that Wallachia and Moldavia should be confirmed in all the rights and privileges secured to them by antecedent treaties, and that the Porte, within a month, should carry into execution the provisions of the convention of Akermann, by which the Servians were to become an independent people. Turkey was to pay within eighteen months 1,500,000 ducats of Holland as an indemnity to Russian merchants, for losses which they might have sustained in the course of this or any preceding war. The liberty of commerce throughout the whole extent of the Turkish empire was secured to Russian subjects, and was declared not to be liable to be checked in any case or under any pretence, by prohibitions or restrictions, nor by any regulation or measure, whether of administration or legislation. Russian vessels were not to be subject to any visit on board on the part of the Ottoman authorities, either out at sea or in any of the ports or roadsteads belonging to the dominions of the Sublime Porte. The Porte declared the passage of the Bosphorus or Channel of Constantinople, and the Strait of the Dardanelles, free to Russian ships under merchant flags, whether coming from the Black Sea to the Mediterranean, or returning from the Mediterranean to the Black Sea, of whatsoever size or tonnage they *might be*. In the same manner, those two straits were

declared free for all the merchant vessels of the powers at peace with the Porte, whether bound to the Russian ports of the Black Sea, or returning from them. Independently of the territory in Asia, secured by the new frontier-line, Russia was to receive, as payment of the expenses of the war, a sum of money, the amount of which was to be fixed by a separate convention. The Sublime Porte now yielded the question of Greek independence, and adhered to the stipulations of Mr. Canning's treaty of the 6th of July, 1827; agreeing, immediately after the exchange of the ratification of the present treaty of peace, to appoint plenipotentiaries to settle with those of Russia, England, and France, the execution of all the stipulations and arrangements relating to Greece.

Though freed from the Turks, the Greeks were still in a very uneasy state. A small French army, which had been sent into the country during 1828, had driven out of the Morea the last fragments of a Turkish army. The French were preparing to cross the isthmus of Corinth, and to drive the Mussulmans out of Northern Greece, when they received orders to undertake no farther operations. It was still undetermined by the allies what should be the limits of the new Greek state. At one time its dimensions were to be extensive, and its frontier a good and strong one: at another time it was to comprise only the Morea and some of the islands. Mischief was sure to rise out of these varying schemes, and in the end the three liberating powers gave the Greeks a very bad frontier. But, when the French ceased to act, the Greeks themselves undertook to expel the Mussulmans from all the northern part of the country, and placing themselves under the command of General Church, a British officer, they reduced Vonnizza and Lepanto, and various other places of strength.

At a conference held on the 16th of November, 1828, the ministers of the three liberating powers at London *resolved upon* a declaration, that the three allied powers *took under their provisional guarantee* the Morea and *the Cyclades*, without prejudicing the question of the

future boundaries of Greece. On the 22nd of March, 1829, these limits were laid down by the same negotiation:—"The continental boundary-line of the Greek state is to be drawn from the gulf of Volo to the gulf of Arta. All countries south of this line to be included in the Greek State, to which the adjacent islands comprehending Eubœa and the Cyclades are likewise to belong." This would have left to the Greeks a small but compact state, and a defensible frontier; this was the frontier which was recommended by our able negotiator, Mr. Stratford Canning, by Colonel Leake, and by a variety of Englishmen who knew the country and wished it well. But it was soon proposed to draw the line still farther to the south, commencing on the east at Zeitoun, near Thermopylæ, and running across the country in the direction of Vlachori, till it reached the river Aspropotamos, whose course it was to follow as far as the sea; thus excluding not only Thessaly, but Acarnania also; and leaving the whole western frontier of northern Greece open to attack. With such a frontier as this there must be perpetual cause of strife and bloodshed. Russia loved the line, because her intrigues and interference could easily be pushed across it, and because she never had the wish that Greece should be powerful. Of anarchy there was already enough in that unhappy land. Count Capo d'Istria had been named president of a government, the form of which had not yet been settled; he had little or no real authority. At Missolonghi the troops fired on his own brother, Count A. Capo d'Istria, who had been appointed commander-in-chief of all the country to the north of the isthmus of Corinth. A general debility, and selfishness, and jealousy, characterised this *pro tempore* government.

In Portugal the reign of terror continued. The Miguelites made a great effort to subdue Terceira, one of the Azores, and the only spot in the dominions of Portugal which remained in the hands of the constitutionalists; but they were totally defeated by the islanders under Count Villaflores. The King of Spain acknowledged the title of *Dom Miguel* to the throne of Portugal, although the

other sovereigns of Europe refused to hold any communication with his government. The English ministers still insisted on the observance of a strict neutrality in regard to all military operations. A considerable armament, under the command of Count Saldanha, set sail from Plymouth, their general pledging his word that they were all going to Brazil. Suspecting Saldanha's real intention, government dispatched a small squadron to watch his proceedings. This squadron found him on the point of disembarking his forces at Terceira. As he appeared determined to push in at all hazards, a shot, at point-blank distance, was fired into his ship, which killed one man and wounded another. Saldanha was in the end obliged to quit that island and that sea. He was watched by the British commander until they arrived within 500 miles of Scilly. Saldanha brought his squadron up on the French coast near Brest.

A.D. 1830.—On the 4th of February, parliament was again opened by commission. The speech lamented that, notwithstanding a strong indication of active commerce, distress should still prevail among the agricultural and manufacturing classes in some parts of the United Kingdom. This subject occupied several days, and it led to various propositions and suggestions. Some thought they could relieve this distress, which was only temporary, and which was by no means so extensive as it was represented, by returning to a paper currency. Mr. Attwood conceived that to make silver a legal tender in lieu of gold would remedy all our evils. What ministers did, was to repeal the beer and leather duties; but they increased the duties on ardent spirits. They also reduced the salaries of various public officers, and abolished some of the offices altogether. Farther reductions were made as well in the navy as in the army, but the opposition was signally defeated when they attempted to carry these reductions a great deal too far.

Various motions were made tending to parliamentary reform. Lord John Russell failed in his motion for *transferring* the elective franchise of East Retford to *Birmingham*; but after this he moved for a bill to confer

that privilege, independently of all other considerations, on Leeds, Birmingham, and Manchester. At this stage, or even at a later, the bestowing of the elective franchise on a few populous and wealthy towns would have satisfied the most of the reformers; but his lordship's motion was rejected by 188 against 140.

Some further improvements in our criminal code were introduced and carried by Mr. Peel. The annual executions for forgeries had been revolting—terrific! The capital punishment was now set aside, except in cases where the forgery touched the privy seal, wills, warrants on the public funds, and orders for the payment of money. Sir James Mackintosh carried an amendment, confining the infliction of death to the forgery of a will only; but this was thrown out by the Lords.

Upon the reports of committees of the House of Commons and of the law commissioners, an act was passed abolishing the separate system of Welsh judicature, and annexing it to that of England.

Parliament was yet sitting when George IV. departed this life. The king's health had been for a considerable time in a precarious state; but he had long lived very secluded. Little was known to the public of what passed in the interior of the palace; and it was not until the 15th of April that the court physicians issued their first bulletin, wherein they announced that he was labouring under a bilious attack, accompanied by embarrassment in his breathing. On the 24th of May a message was delivered to both Houses of parliament, stating that his majesty found it inconvenient to sign public documents with his own hand, and requesting parliament to provide means for the temporary discharge of that function of the crown, without detriment to the public service. The necessary bill was passed. The sign-manual was allowed to be executed with a stamp: the stamp was to be used in the king's presence by some person authorised by his majesty's word of mouth; but no document was to be stamped before it had been indorsed by three members of *the privy council*.

At the end of June it was reported that the king was getting better; but he burst a blood-vessel, and expired at three o'clock in the morning of the 26th of June. The feeling of the people at this occurrence approached nearer to indifference than to any other sentiment.

END OF VOL XXV.

THE
CAMBIST
History
England
VOL. XXVI



CABINET HISTORY OF ENGLAND.

BOOK XI.—*Continued.*

CHAPTER I.—*Continued.*

WILLIAM IV.

WILLIAM HENRY, Duke of Clarence, was forthwith proclaimed by the title of William IV. No immediate alteration took place in the government, his majesty signifying to the Duke of Wellington and the ministers of his cabinet that he was anxious to retain their services. A portion of the Whigs had been for some time contemplating a coalition with the Wellington and Peel party; but their advances were not met half way, and the Whigs more resolutely than before took up the cry for a reform in parliament.

On Friday, the 23rd of July, his majesty went in state to the House of Lords, and, after a most gracious speech, prorogued parliament. The necessary dissolution was made next day by proclamation; and writs were ordered for the election of a new parliament, to be returnable on the 14th of September.

On the 28th of July the throne of Charles X. of France was overturned by the populace of Paris. This unfortunate prince had displayed much less prudence and moderation than his predecessor and elder brother, Louis XVIII. But there had been an incessant plotting against the throne in the time of Louis, and had Charles been a wiser king he would none the less have been ex-

posed to similar machinations. The court party, not without good grounds for such credence, firmly believed that one portion of the French nation was determined at all hazards to get rid of the Bourbons and of monarchy, and to try over again the republic, with its blood-shedding, spoliation, irreligion, and atheism. On the other side, that great portion of the French nation, having also some grounds for its belief, were intimately persuaded that the king and his chief advisers contemplated nothing less than the subversion of the constitutional charter, the suppression of the liberty of the press, and the enforcement of a bigoted intolerant religion under the auspices and guidance of the Jesuits. And this party had long been making and maturing preparations for a rising, while the royalists had made no preparation at all. Those who well knew France in July, 1829, were not much taken by surprise at the events of July, 1830. It was impossible to travel through the country with eyes open in 1829 without seeing that the popular masses and the greater part of the army were ripe for revolt. By fatality or fatuity, the king and his ministers put themselves completely in the wrong, and so remained chargeable as being the aggressors in this inevitable contest, which almost any accident might have brought about at any given moment. Finding themselves unable to manage or control the liberals in the chambers, Charles and his ministers agreed that they must instantly dissolve the Chamber of Deputies. Instead of losing, the liberals gained immensely by the new election. They were preparing to assemble, when the king, by ordinance, dissolved the newly-elected chamber, introduced a new law of election, and suspended the liberty of the press. The royal ordonnances, which in reality superseded the constitution, were issued on the 25th of July. On the morning of the 26th the gens-d'armes and other agents of the police began to seize the types and break up the presses of some of the refractory journalists who had long been intimating that a change of dynasty or a return to *republicanism* was as inevitable as it was desirable, and *who would not now be silent at the bidding of an un-*

constitutional illegal command. It was these journalists who, during a series of years, had prepared the public mind for revolution. They saw their moment was now come. Paris was covered with their papers and placards, and they presented themselves bodily to the people as sufferers and martyrs in the cause of liberty; and, pointing to their invaded houses, their broken presses, and their scattered types, they asked whether these things were to be permitted? Whether Frenchmen would be quiet and be slaves, or fight and be free? M. Thiers, one of the very foremost of this active newspaper corps, being a man of short stature, placed himself on a bench, or some say on a wine-cask, in front of his office, and harangued with great effect. M. Mignet, another of the corps, and an historian of the most approved and decided republicanism, also harangued and gesticulated, exhorting the people to shed the last drop of their blood rather than submit to the tyranny of a fool and bigot. But human nature has its weaknesses. When the popular storm was effectually raised—when hard fighting was carrying on in the streets of Paris—when cannon balls as well as musket shots were flying all about, and while, as yet, it seemed rather doubtful whether Marshal Marmont or the mob would beat, Messieurs Thiers and Mignet stole away to the deserted town-house of a friend, took out his cabriolet and horse, and driving from the Faubourgs with all the speed that was in the poor beast, never stopped until they reached the secluded valley of Montmorency, at the distance of six leagues from Paris. And there, in a country-house, they lay until the evening of the third of the three glorious days, when the maire of that locality—a revolutionist like themselves—visited the house, and joyfully announced to all within it that the people had triumphed, and that the last resistance of the court had ceased. The name of the cabriolet steed was Fabius. Can the ex-premier of France have forgotten it? It was a serviceable animal to him and to M. Mignet, at that time his bosom friend. No sooner had the maire given assurance of the correctness of his information, than Fabius was again put to.

and, descending the valley of Montmorency as rapidly as they had ascended it, Messieurs Thiers and Mignet drove for Paris to claim their share in the spoils of victory, or in those good things which revolutions lay open to needy and bustling men. And verily the share of M. Thiers has been a large one.

The blundering court was taken wholly by surprise. Marshal Marmont had scarcely 5000 men, and not one-half of them could be depended upon. We will not describe the fighting: it began seriously on the afternoon of the 27th. On the 28th the regiments of the line joined the people; and it was all over by three o'clock in the afternoon of the 29th. The number of the killed and wounded was not very considerable. The people fought under cover, and with every advantage in their favour. They were disproportionately applauded for their moderation and clemency in the hour of victory; but they were only moderate because the resistance to them had been faint, and because they conceived that they would have everything their own way. If the resistance had been desperate, or if the final result had been long kept doubtful, Europe would have seen a repetition of the horrors of 1791 and 1792.

The elder branch of the royal line of Bourbon was driven once more to seek an asylum in a foreign country, and to hide for a time its dishonoured head within the walls of Holyrood Palace. But the sincere fanatics of republicanism were wofully disappointed when that vain inept old man Lafayette, drawn once more by the accidents and circumstances of the time from solitude and obscurity, passed his arm round the neck of Louis Philippe, son of the Duke of Orleans, or the Philippe Egalité of the former revolution, and, addressing the people, said, "*Voilà la meilleure des républiques*,"—Here is your best of republics! Had these liberty and equality men been duped? Had they been playing the game of others? There was no doubt of it. Republic there was *to be none*. But Louis Philippe, with monarchy hereditary in his family, was to take quiet possession of the *throne from which his aged kinsman had been driven*.

From that moment the fanatics and the desperadoes renewed against the new king the plots they had kept up against the old one. Louis Philippe had mounted the throne through the barricades; they would try if barricades could not make him descend from it: as for those of the late agitators who were not fanatics in republicanism, but were time-servers and self-seekers, they soon settled down quietly under the re-established royalty, and took the good things which the gods or Louis Philippe gave them.

The ultra-Whigs hailed the event as the dawning of a new and glorious day in the history of mankind. Public meetings were held to pass resolutions commending the spirit with which the Parisians had shaken off encroaching despotism; deputations were sent to congratulate them on their triumph; and subscriptions were proposed to relieve the families of those heroic citizens who had suffered in the cause. At some of these meetings, and in some of the more radical newspapers and other periodical works, the people were called upon to consider how little was to be feared from military power, and how much could be done by pikes, barricades, and reversed coaches, carts, and omnibuses. As in the year 1790, the French now boasted that their revolution would make the tour of the globe. It very soon travelled into Belgium and into Poland, and it cast a few of its firebrands into Italy, Saxony, Brunswick, Switzerland, and other countries. The Belgians had long been dissatisfied with their union with the Dutch; but that union might have lasted many a long year but for the events of Paris. On the 25th of August a riot broke out at Brussels, which very soon assumed a character of political insurrection. The flame spread to Liege, Namur, and other cities. The Dutch troops, numerically weak, could not maintain themselves in Brussels, that capital was evacuated after very little fighting; and Belgium was declared to be a separate and independent nation.

In the autumn the inhabitants of a large part of *France—the part nearest to our own coast—intimated by*

many excesses that their revolution had not brought the millennium with it. All Normandy and Brittany were set in a blaze by rick-burners and stack-burners. As if this madness were epidemic, it spread to England, and Kent and part of Sussex soon blazed at night like Normandy and Brittany.

It was under circumstances of gloom and anxiety that the new parliament assembled on the 26th of October. The king opened the session in person. In his speech he alluded to the events which had occurred on the continent; to the continuance of his diplomatic relations with the new French dynasty; to the endeavours which, in concert with his allies, he was making to restore tranquillity to the Netherlands; and to the expediency of maintaining those general treaties by which the political system of Europe had been established. The usual addresses were carried in both houses, though not without very evident signs of a vigorous opposition to ministers. The rallying cry was "Parliamentary Reform," or "Parliamentary Reform and Retrenchment." The Duke of Wellington resolutely declared that he would grant no reform—that no reform was necessary—that the constitution would be spoiled if an attempt were made to amend it. In replying to Earl Grey, he said, "that he would not hesitate unequivocally to declare his opinion that we possessed a legislature which answered all good purposes, better than any which had been ever tried; and that if he had to frame a legislature for another country, his aim would be to form one which would produce similar results: under such circumstances, he was not only unprepared to bring forward any measure of reform, but ready at once to declare that, so long as he held a station in the government, he should feel it his duty to resist any such measures when proposed by others." In the Commons, Mr. Brougham brought forward the question of reform even before the address was moved. He reprobated the report that he was desirous of introducing a radical, sweeping innovation. This report was *utterly devoid of truth*. He, for one, was resolved to *take his stand on the ancient ways of the constitution*.

The king and queen had promised to honour the lord mayor's feast at Guildhall with their presence. The citizens had made magnificent preparations for their reception. Late on the evening of the 7th of November the lord mayor received a note from the home secretary (Mr. Peel), stating that his majesty had resolved, by the advice of his ministers, to postpone his visit to the city to a future opportunity, *because*, from information recently received, "there was reason to apprehend that, notwithstanding the devoted loyalty and affection borne to his majesty by the citizens of London, advantage would be taken of an occasion which must necessarily assemble a vast number of persons by night to produce tumult and confusion, and thereby to endanger the properties and lives of his majesty's subjects; and it would be a source of deep and lasting concern to their majesties were any calamity to occur on the occasion of their visit to the city of London." This announcement filled the metropolis with doubt and alarm. Men believed that some atrocious conspiracy against the royal person had been discovered, or that the poorer classes had organised a revolution. The funds fell, and in the provinces it was pretty generally expected that the next mail would bring intelligence that London was in a state of insurrection. By the advice of ministers, the purposed visit of the king was abandoned.

The most was made of the event by the opposition in Parliament. It was laid to the account of ministers that his majesty could not meet his faithful Commons of London without fear and riot. It was urged that the exceeding unpopularity of the Duke of Wellington had been the cause of so shameful an occurrence; and that that excessive unpopularity had been caused by the fatal declaration of the duke against every species of reform. It was asked whether the duke did not now feel that he had quitted his own proper sphere of greatness? whether a ministry so unpopular could hope to stand?

On the 15th of November Sir Henry Parnell moved for a select committee to make a thorough revision of the *civil list*. The debate was a short one. Mr. Calcraft

and Mr. Herries, both members of the government, opposed the motion, principally on the ground that it never had been customary to submit the civil list to a committee, and that retrenchment and simplification had now been carried as far as was practicable or prudent. The motion was supported by the Whig Lord Althorpe, and by the Tories Messrs. Bankes, Wynne, and Holme Sumner. On the division there appeared a majority of 29 against ministers, the numbers being 233 to 204.

Next day the Duke of Wellington in the Lords, and Sir Robert Peel in the Commons, announced that, in consequence of the vote of the preceding evening, they had tendered, and his majesty had accepted, their resignations, and that they continued to hold their offices only until successors should be appointed. They afterwards declared that they had come to this resolution not so much on account of the civil-list vote as from an anticipation of the result of a division on Mr. Brougham's proposition for reform, which stood for the very day on which the announcement was made.

The Tories and anti-emancipationists had lent their votes to displace the Duke of Wellington, but by themselves they were not strong enough to entertain any hope of setting up a cabinet of their own. The Canning party were far asunder from them, some of them being all for the duke and some for reform. The king had no choice. He could only take the Whigs. Accordingly he authorised Earl Grey to form a new administration. The Earl accepted the office on condition that he should have his majesty's authority to make parliamentary reform a cabinet measure. In the course of a week the new government was put together: it contained a considerable admixture of those who had been adherents of Mr. Canning and Mr. Huskisson.

Earl Grey was first lord of the treasury; Mr. Brougham, lord chancellor; Lord Althorpe, chancellor of the exchequer; Lord Melbourne, home secretary; Lord Palmerston, foreign secretary; Lord Goderich, colonial secretary; Sir James Graham, first lord of the admiralty; Marquess of Lansdowne, president of the council; Lord

Durham, lord privy seal; Lord Hill, commander-in-chief; Lord Auckland, president of the board of trade; Mr. C. Grant, president of the board of control; Lord Holland, duchy of Lancaster; the Duke of Devonshire, lord chamberlain; the Duke of Richmond, postmaster-general; Lord John Russell, paymaster of the forces; the Right Hon. C. W. Wynne, secretary-at-war, &c. &c. Mr. Denman became attorney-general, Sir William Horne, solicitor-general. The Marquess of Anglesey was again appointed lord-lieutenant for Ireland.

There was a suspension of business in parliament till the new members should be re-elected. Mr. Stanley, the new chief-secretary for Ireland, encountered a mortifying defeat at Preston, where the right of suffrage was almost universal. He was opposed by Orator Hunt, and by that demagogue and by radical reform, the heir of the house of Derby, a member of the new Whig ministry, and the representative of temperate and moderate reform was completely beaten.

During the remainder of the year no business of importance was transacted, except the passing of a regency bill. This bill provided that, in the event of a posthumous child of the present Queen, her majesty should be guardian and regent during the minority. If no such event should occur, the Duchess of Kent was to be guardian and regent during the minority of her daughter, the Princess Victoria, the heiress presumptive. The Princess Victoria was not to marry, while a minor, without the consent of the king, or, if he died, without the consent of both houses of parliament: and the regency of the Duchess of Kent was to be at an end if, while regent, she married a foreigner.

On the 23rd of December Parliament adjourned to the 3rd of February, ministers having declared that a long adjournment was necessary, in order that they might have time to prepare the different measures which they intended to submit, and more especially to concoct that plan of reform to which they had pledged themselves on accepting office, and by which alone they could hope to *retain it*.

In the course of this eventful year there came into operation in England a change far more important than all the political mutations on the continent put together. The first great railway with locomotive engines—that between Liverpool and Manchester—was finished and opened; and the triumphant success of the experiment led directly to the construction of far more extensive lines. Unhappily the opening of the Liverpool and Manchester Railway was clouded by the lamentable death of Mr. Huskisson, one of the members for Liverpool, who had accompanied the Duke of Wellington to the celebration.

Before the revolution of July the French government had sent a powerful fleet and a large army to Algiers. That city, so strong towards the sea, was very weak on the land side. Marshal Bourmont soon compelled the Dey to capitulate, and the French took possession of the city, the forts, and all the neighbouring country. The Dey retired to Italy, where he very soon learned that Charles X., who had dispossessed him, had been driven from his throne and country. At first the French gave out that they intended merely a temporary occupation of Algiers, for the good of humanity and the perpetual suppression of corsairs. They signalized their entrance into the city by detestable acts of cruelty and indecency; and they had not been long there before they announced that Algiers naturally belonged to France—that the French must have an extensive African empire as a set-off to our Indian empire, and to our sugar and coffee bearing islands in the West Indies. Had they begun with moderation they might easily have conciliated a very large proportion of the native inhabitants; had they proceeded consistently, and with temperance, gentleness, and wisdom, they might have converted Algeria into a valuable colony: but their conduct has been consistently violent and wrong; and hence is it that Algeria has been a heavy annual drain on their treasure and their blood. The corsairs, though a predominant and tyrannical class, were comparatively few in numbers. The majority of the citizens of Algiers, the whole body

of the country people, had never had any sympathy with them, and would have witnessed their fall and expulsion with joy. The mass of the Arab population were quiet cultivators of the soil. The French treated them all as if they had been robbers and pirates.

The year closed on the continent of Europe with revolutions and insurrections. "It is something in the air," said an old Frenchman, who for the third time was an exile for political opinions.

In England men had employed themselves in framing radical reform unions and concocting or preparing alarming petitions. The language held at some of our public meetings had evidently been inspired by the patriots of Paris—how bad a source of English inspiration! But for the revolution of July the precipitate Reform Bill would not have been carried.

A.D. 1831.—Ministers had certainly done nothing to cool or repress the excited feeling which existed all around them, and than which nothing could be more unfavourable to the calm discussion of so grave a question as the altering of our constitution. Every demagogue, however extravagant, every ranter at a radical meeting, styled himself the friend of the reform ministry, and most of them were treated as such. Ministers would not cool the attachment of men who kept up the cry and guided the voice of the populace.

On the 3rd of February, the appointed day, Parliament re-assembled, and Earl Grey in the Lords, and Viscount Althorpe in the Commons, announced that a plan of parliamentary reform had been agreed to by ministers, and would be introduced at as early a period as possible. It was not, however, until the 1st of March that the plan was introduced in the Commons by Lord John Russell. The plan, we believe, had been altered and re-altered during the interval. Lord John Russell now declared that ministers discarded the notion of complying with violent and extravagant demands. Their wish was to frame a measure which would give satisfaction to every reasonable man in the country: they wished to take *their stand between two hostile parties*, neither agreeing

with the bigots on the one hand, that no reform was necessary, nor agreeing with the fanatics on the other, that only one particular reform could be wholesome and satisfactory.

The leading principles of the ministerial plan consisted, first, of disfranchisement of small places which had hitherto sent members to parliament, and of enfranchisement of large towns and cities which had hitherto been unrepresented : of an extension of the franchise, in order to increase the number of electors in those places which were allowed to retain in whole, or in part, their existing privileges. All voters were to be duly registered—an excellent regulation. In order to diminish the expenses of elections, as well as opportunities for bribery, drunkenness, and corruption of all kinds, the duration of the poll was to be diminished ; and that for counties to be taken simultaneously at different places. The good which has proceeded from this regulation is indisputable and great. Lord John Russell said that the general result of the measure would be to create a new constituency of about half a million ; for the increase in counties would be about 100,000, that in towns already represented about 110,000, that in the new boroughs 50,000, that in London 95,000, that in Scotland 60,000, and that in Ireland about 40,000. His lordship declared himself against short parliaments and vote by ballot, and concluded by requesting leave to bring in his bill. This motion brought on a debate which lasted seven nights, and which called up more than seventy orators. The opponents of it said that the whole essence of the scheme was not reform but revolution ; that the proposed measure proposed nothing less than to remove from the House of Commons every alloy of monarchical or aristocratical principle, and convert into a pure and resistless democracy, which it never had been, and which, consistently with the British constitution, it never ought to be. This new constitution rested on some supposed necessity for *increasing* the power of the people ; but the power of the *people was already strong enough* : the true danger to *be dreaded* in our mixed government arose from the influ-

ence of the people, and not from the influence of the crown or of the aristocracy. Was it intended to convert these kingdoms into an unrestricted democracy? Were ministers prepared to say that a mob could govern a mob? There was a variety of interests connected with the country which required to be represented in parliament, and were now represented by means of the boroughs (called rotten) that were to be disfranchised by this bill. If they were so disfranchised, the representation of those interests would be annihilated. Mr. Horace Twiss said he had no objection to any increase of the representation of great trading interests; but he could not see the policy of calling in the wisdom of householders paying 10*l.* of rent. The measure would let in no great interests: it would promote the influence of shopkeepers and country attorneys. The leader of the country club would now be the important man in his district, and these interests, however respectable in their way, were not the interests which required additional representation. They were interests which would be represented under the proposed change, by those shallow but dogged politicians, with whom relief from taxation was everything, and public credit and national faith nothing—by whom rent and tithe were regarded as vile incumbrances. And when half the constitution had thus been surrendered, would the violent reformers be satisfied? They themselves had avowed that they would not; and that, having obtained so much, they would, at a convenient time, demand more. It was not this parliamentary reform that could reduce the present expenditure or pay off the debts of the past. Numerous references were made to the French revolution and to the imitations of it in other parts of Europe. The promoters of the bill more than hinted that the reformers would try a revolution in England, if they were not pacified by this measure: the opposers of the bill denied that there was any such fear—denied that the measure would satisfy the Radicals. There was a better security than the moderation or timidity of the Radicals for the preservation of order. The widely-spread industry of the country, the stored-up savings even of the lower orders,

the dividends of the public stocks, were solid grounds for confidence in the security of the institutions of the country. The very burdens of the country formed some sort of security for its tranquillity and welfare. The superincumbent weight of the national debt, while it pressed, gave stability. There would be no revolution to fear nor any permanent dissatisfaction to dread. But if we decided on this great question, not according to experience and wisdom, but according to the cry of the day, then we should let in danger, then we should let in revolution by teaching the people that their impatient will alone could control the course of the legislature. The opponents of the bill, however, permitted this long contest to terminate without a division: and Lord John Russell's bill was brought in, and ordered to be read a first time. Ministers afterwards admitted that if a division had now taken place, they would, according to their calculation, have been left in a minority. But the opposition did not form a combined body; it had no regular plan of operations, and it was guided by no great leader.

Between the first reading and the motion for the second reading, strenuous efforts were made to convince the Radical party to rest satisfied with the bill, and not commit the cause of reform by asking for more than could be granted. Nor were these efforts wholly unsuccessful; the manufacturers of petitions were again set to work, and the same places which a month ago had petitioned for far more, now joined in praying that the bill might pass untouched. During the same anxious interval the political clubs and associations continued their labours and demonstrations. Monster meetings were held, and threats resorted to. The chairman of the Birmingham Political Union openly declared that that town and neighbourhood could supply two armies, each of them as numerous and as brave as that which had conquered at Waterloo, if the patriot king and his ministers should require them in the contest with the boroughmongers—under which appellation were now comprehended all who differed from themselves in opinion. At a reform meeting held in London, Colonel Evans announced, that he had just arrived

from Sussex, where two reform meetings had taken place, and he assured the Londoners that he knew that 10,000 men were ready to march up from Reigate to the support of his majesty's ministers, if they should be defeated in the measure now before the House.

On the 21st of March the second reading of the bill was moved in the Commons. The debate lasted two days. It was opened by Sir R. Vyvyan, who moved, as an amendment, that the bill should be read a second time that day six months. At the division there were, including the speaker and the four tellers, 603 members present, the largest number that had ever divided on any question in that House. Of these 302 were for the original motion, and 301 for the amendment; the second reading being thus carried by a majority of *one*.

On the 18th of April Lord John Russell moved the order of the day for a committee of the whole House, when General Gascoyne immediately endeavoured to get rid of the bill by a motion for counteracting one of its essential clauses, respecting the proposed diminution of the number of representatives for England and Wales. This motion led to a violent debate, ending in a division on the following night, which left ministers in a minority of 8.

Two days after this division, or on the 21st of April, Lord Wharncliffe in the Upper House asked Earl Grey whether ministers had advised his majesty to dissolve this parliament, which had not yet existed quite six months. He put the question, he said, because, if he received a certain answer, it was his intention to adopt some measure in relation to that subject. Earl Grey replied that he declined answering the question. Lord Wharncliffe then gave notice that he would next day move an address to the king, praying that his majesty would be graciously pleased not to exercise his own undoubted prerogative of dissolving parliament. On the same day Sir R. Vyvyan asked ministers in the Commons whether they intended to proceed with the Reform Bill, or to advise his majesty to dissolve parliament, *because the House of Commons would not consent to reduce the*

number of English members? The chancellor of the exchequer, Lord Althorpe, replied, "that he had no hesitation in answering one of the questions, or in saying that ministers, having considered the necessary consequence of the division of the House on the bill the other evening, it was not their intention to proceed farther with the bill. It would not be consistent with his duty to answer the second question." Lord Althorpe, one of the most honest, amiable, and straightforward of men, must not for a moment be suspected of insincerity or falsehood. When these words were uttered by him in the House of Commons, ministers had made up neither their own minds nor the mind of the king to the unusual measure of so sudden a dissolution. Many things connected with the Reform Bill were done in such a hurry that they could scarcely have been foreseen the day before. On the 22nd, which was the very day after the question was put by Lord Wharncliffe and Sir R. Vyvyan, there was a great ferment in both Houses, for the rumour had been spread in the course of the day that king and ministers had made up their mind for dissolution. In the Lords the ferment became a storm, a tempest. The order of the day was Lord Wharncliffe's motion for an address to his majesty against the dissolution. His lordship had uttered only a few words, when the Duke of Richmond, postmaster-general in this recently-seated ministry, rose to complain that all the peers were not sitting in their proper places, as was usual on such occasions. Some expressions of dissent being uttered, his grace of Richmond insisted that the standing order should be enforced—that their lordships should keep their places, and that persons present who were not members of that House should be ordered to withdraw. Noise and confusion ensued, and the Marquess of Londonderry was heard to say that ministers were taking the crown off the king's head. The Duke of Richmond would then move another standing order—that against *the use of improper language*. The Marquess of Londonderry denied that any offensive language had been used, "though the noble duke seemed to think himself the

hero of this *coup d'état*, and to be able to smother the expression of their lordships' sentiments on this most extraordinary occasion." Lord Wharncliffe being allowed to proceed, hurriedly moved—"That an humble address be presented to his majesty, humbly to represent that we, his majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects, the lords spiritual and temporal, &c., think ourselves bound in duty humbly to represent to his majesty that alarming reports of an intended dissolution of parliament have gone forth; that, dutifully acknowledging the wisdom of the constitution in trusting to the crown that just and legal prerogative, and fully confiding in his majesty's royal wisdom and paternal care of his people, for the most beneficial exercise of it, we desire with great humility to represent to his majesty, that it appears to us that a prorogation or dissolution of parliament at the present juncture, and under the present excitement of the public mind, both in Great Britain and Ireland, is likely to be attended with great danger to his majesty's crown and dignity, and to every institution of the state, by preventing that calm and deliberate consideration of any question tending to the reform of the representation of the people which the importance of that subject so especially requires." The lord chancellor (Brougham) exclaimed,—“My lords, I have not yet heard it doubted that the king possessed the prerogative of dissolving parliament at pleasure, still less have I ever known a doubt to exist on the subject at a moment when the Lower House has thought fit to refuse the supplies.” And his lordship having uttered these words, hurried out of the House to receive the king, whose near approach was announced. Lord Shaftesbury being called to the woolsack, amidst great excitement and discordant noises, succeeded in restoring some degree of order. Lord Mansfield then addressed the House. Such a scene as this, he said, he had never before witnessed in that House, and he hoped never to see anything like it again. He had heard from the noble and learned lord on the woolsack, with the utmost surprise, that the House of Commons *refused the supplies*. The noble and learned lord had,

indeed, perhaps with wilful ignorance, declared this to be the case. The supplies had not been refused. He would use no intemperate language, but he would nevertheless assert, as far as God Almighty gave him the means of understanding, that the crown and the country were now about to be placed in a most awful predicament, unparalleled at any previous period. He must accuse his majesty's ministers of weakness and incapacity—of conspiring together against the safety of the state and the dignity of the crown by acting in such a manner upon such a question. He had not stated his opinions generally on the Reform Bill, because it was not before the House, and he really was always of opinion that the bill would never come there, and that it would necessarily end in a complete abortion. He had himself, as a peer, given his advice to the sovereign—he had told his majesty that if, for the sake of this Reform Bill, he should give his assent to a sudden dissolution of parliament, it would be a measure pregnant with danger.

Lord Mansfield was yet speaking when the king entered the House and put an end to all discussion. The House of Commons having been summoned, his majesty prorogued parliament with a speech in which he said the prorogation was with a view to immediate dissolution, and that he had been induced to resort to this measure for the purpose of ascertaining the sense of his people in the way in which it could be most constitutionally expressed, on the expediency of making such changes in the representation as circumstances might appear to require. The speech also thanked the Commons for the supplies which they had voted. Next day came forth the proclamation announcing a dissolution and directing a new election. The writs were made returnable on the 14th of June.

The dissolution was celebrated in many places by illuminations. The lord mayor authorised an illumination of the city of London. At the west-end a rabble vented their fury on the houses or windows of several peers and commoners, because they had opposed the Reform Bill. Among the windows which suffered

most were those of the Duke of Wellington and Mr. Baring. "In political disputes, to place candles in windows is no proof of political opinion or of anything else except a prudent desire to avoid the outrages of a mob ; but these illuminations were made use of by the reformers to keep up their incessant cry that the inhabitants of the country, from one end to another, were animated by one universal feeling of enthusiasm for the Reform Bill, and for the act which got rid of a parliament that would never have passed it."*

During this session Earl Grey's cabinet had not only declared that there could be no reduction in the national expenditure, but they had also increased the standing army by 8000 men, confessing that this increase was rendered necessary by the disturbed state of England as well as Ireland. These facts, however, did not shake the confidence of political enthusiasts in the will and capability of ministers, and it was laid down as a moral certainty that, with a reformed parliament, this cabinet would be enabled to lighten the public burdens to a prodigious extent. The general elections commenced and ended in a popular tempest. All manner of appeals had been made to the people in order to excite them. The antagonists of the bill were represented not merely as the corrupt and profligate enemies of the liberties of the people, but also as dangerous and audacious contemners of the loyalty which they owed to the monarch. It had been assumed all along that the heart of the king was in the bill. The king's name was therefore made the watchword of democracy. Now, too, were begun practices which tended to turn the representatives of the people into mere delegates. Pledges were demanded from candidates that they would vote for "the Bill, the whole Bill, and nothing but the Bill." Men were to be sent to parliament not to exercise their understanding on the principles of reform which ought to be applied, but merely to say Yea to every proposition which ministers might produce as a part of the bill. Printed lists of the

* Annual Register for 1831.

majority and minority on General Gascoyne's motion were assiduously circulated through the country, and every candidate whose name was found in the majority was denounced as an enemy of reform, although many of those gentlemen were really reformers who were willing to grant representatives to the great towns, and only unwilling that disfranchisement should be carried too far, and the total number of English members diminished. In every respect the reforming electors, instead of merely choosing legislators, set themselves up as legislators themselves. They did not elect men on whose honesty and understanding they could rely, but they elected men as speaking-trumpets to deliver and re-echo their own opinion. A ministry *in esse* always has and must have a great influence over elections. We need not say how the influence of the Grey cabinet was exercised. Stormy everywhere, the elections were downright riots in many parts of Scotland and Ireland. General Gascoyne found it impossible to make head in Liverpool; Sir R. Vyvyan was expelled from Cornwall; Sir Edward Knatchbull did not venture to contest the county of Kent; Sir Robert Wilson, an ultra-reformer, but who had dared to think that it was not the time to diminish the number of English representatives, durst not show his face in Southwark, where he was succeeded by Mr. W. Brougham, a brother of the new lord chancellor; Mr. Bankes was defeated in Dorsetshire by Mr. Calcraft, whose sudden conversion to the doctrines of ministers had carried the second reading of the Reform Bill; Lord Lowther's candidates were defeated in Cumberland and at Carlisle; and in many other directions, returns were made of members who were for the bill, the whole bill, and nothing but the bill.

The new parliament met on the 14th of June, but it occupied a week to swear in the members, to elect a speaker, &c.; and it was not until the 21st that the session was opened by the king in person. The opening speech contained a recommendation that the Reform Bill should claim the earliest and most attentive consideration of parliament. It expressed the confident hope that

peace would be maintained by England, notwithstanding the civil commotions which had disturbed some parts of Europe, and the contests that were existing in Poland. It stated that a British squadron had been sent before Lisbon with a peremptory demand of satisfaction for a series of insults and injuries ; that a prompt compliance with that demand had prevented the necessity of further measures, but that his majesty had not yet been enabled to re-establish his diplomatic relations with the Portuguese government. The only dismal parts of the speech were those which referred to the spread in Europe of the cholera morbus, and the scarcity and famine which prevailed in the western counties of Ireland, and to the system of violence and outrage which had for some time been carried on to an alarming extent in that country. As the king returned to St. James's Palace he was vociferously applauded by the people as "the Patriot King," "the Sailor King," "the best King that had ever been."

In both Houses the government was severely blamed for not acting with proper vigour in suppressing the disgraceful riotous proceedings at the late illuminations. The addresses were agreed to without any useless division. And then to the Reform Bill.

On the 24th of June Lord John Russell again brought forward that bill, admitting that there had been some slight alterations made in it, and insisting that all such alterations were improvements. Sir Robert Peel professed his unaltered sentiments in opposition to the measure. The first reading was allowed to pass, but at Sir Robert's suggestion, the second reading was postponed from the 30th of June to the 4th of July. The alterations which had been made in the bill went rather to enlarge than to limit the number of electors.

On the 4th of July when the second reading was proposed, Sir John Walsh moved as an amendment that the bill should be read a second time that day six months. The debate, prolonged to very late hours, was continued during the 5th and 6th. At the end the division showed a majority of 136 in favour of ministers ; the votes for

the second reading being 367, and those for the amendment 231. Other efforts were made to obstruct the passage of the bill into committee, and five distinct motions for adjournment were made and defeated. In committee the bill was discussed clause by clause from the 12th of July to the 15th of September, when it was ordered to be engrossed. On the 19th of September Lord John Russell moved the third reading, and was backed by 113 against 58. After two more days of debate on the question "that the bill do pass," ministers carried their point by 345 against 236. Next day, the 22nd of September, the bill was carried up to the Lords by Lord John Russell, attended by about 100 of its staunch supporters in the Lower House. The bill was then read a first time on the motion of Earl Grey, without any remark being made, and was directed to be read a second time on the 3rd of October.

In the interval which had been occupied by these debates, 10,000*l.* per annum had been added to the income of the Duchess of Kent, to support the honour and dignity of the Princess Victoria as presumptive heiress to the crown; it appearing that, in consequence of the election of Prince Leopold of Saxe-Cobourg, widower of the Princess Charlotte, to the throne of Belgium, the allowance of 6000*l.* per annum which he had hitherto made to his sister and niece, had been withdrawn. During the same interval, on the 8th of September, the king and queen had been crowned in Westminster Abbey with infinitely less pageantry than had been displayed at the coronation of George IV., and without any dinner at Westminster Hall. The king, who delighted in one of the titles the people gave him, was dressed in a naval uniform. There followed the usual creations or promotions in the peerage. The peerage was hereby increased, but not to the extent the reform party desired for their present purpose—the passing of the Reform Bill through the Upper House. Subsequently 28 names were added to the list of baronets of the United Kingdom.

On the third of October, after the presentation of

numerous petitions in favour of the bill, Earl Grey moved the second reading. His speech on this occasion was chiefly remarkable by an appeal to the bench of bishops. He said, as they were the ministers of peace, he did most earnestly hope that the result of their votes would be such as might tend to the tranquillity and happiness of the country. And this again was intimidation; for, in other words, it was telling the prelates that if they voted against the Reform Bill, the tranquillity and happiness of the country would be put in peril. Lord Wharncliffe again declared that the bill would destroy the constitution by giving too great power to a most democratically constituted House of Commons. A popular or rather delegated House of Commons had passed this measure, and now the Upper House was told that it had nothing to do but to record and register it. His lordship concluded by moving "that the bill be rejected;" but on being reminded that this mode of proceeding implied disrespect toward the Lower House, Lord Wharncliffe withdrew his motion for another "that the second reading be postponed to that day six months." The Lords then adjourned. On the next day the principal speakers were, for the bill Viscount Melbourne, and against it Lord Harrowby and the Duke of Wellington. The debate was again adjourned, to be renewed on the morrow. Lord Dudley and Ward, the Marquess of Londonderry, Lords Wynford and Eldon, argued against the whole bill with great force and with equal excitement. Lord Chancellor Brougham concluded a speech of four hours' duration, by conjuring their lordships to pass the bill, as the only means of preserving tranquillity. "As your friend," said he, "as the friend of my country, as the servant of my sovereign, I counsel you to assist us in preserving the national peace and perpetuating the national prosperity. For these reasons I pray and beseech you not to reject this bill! I call on you by all you hold most dear, by all that binds every one of us to our common country—I solemnly adjure you, yea, even on bended knees, my lords (here the chancellor bent his knee on the woolsack), I implore you not to reject this

bill!" Their lordships, however, at 6 o'clock on the following morning did reject the bill by a clear majority of 41.

Then ensued an excitement, a turbulence even greater than that of the late general election. Great meetings were instantly convened in the metropolis. One was held at the Thatched House Tavern, consisting of all the members who had voted for the bill in the Commons. The common council of London, who counted a majority of reformers, also assembled. There was another meeting at the Mansion House of merchants and bankers of the reforming party, who passed resolutions approving the conduct of Earl Grey's government, and pledging themselves to its support. There was a tropical rain-fall of petitions to the king, praying his majesty to continue his ministers in office, and to create new peers in sufficient number to carry the bill through the Upper House. The mob, who had been taught by the radical newspapers and the harangues of demagogues that there ought to be no peers at all, that nothing in human nature was so detestable as a lord, were now told they must shout for "more lords—more peers." Fifty thousand persons in the train of my Lord Mayor Sir John Key went up to St. James's Palace to present a petition. Mr. Joseph Hume, M.P., exhorted them to be firm, united, and peaceable. The last part of the advice was thrown away. The mob went and smashed the windows of the Marquess of Bristol and the Duke of Wellington. Being driven by the police from Apsley House, the duke's residence, they went off by Piccadilly and Park Lane to the mansion of Lord Dudley and Ward, but there they were held in check by a strong body of the police. They then collected in Hyde Park to look out for anti-reforming peers. There the Marquess of Londonderry was severely pelted, and the Duke of Cumberland was dragged from his horse, and was thought in some danger of being killed, when a band of policemen came up and dispersed the cowardly assailants.

The day before these exhibitions of violence, Lord Ebrington in the House of Commons moved a resolution declaratory of unabated confidence in the king's ministers,

and the determination to adhere to the Reform Bill. The resolution was carried by a majority of 131. Both Houses were occupied for several nights in desultory but violent discussions on the disturbed state of the country, and on the causes which originally led to such disturbance. The friends of reform held that the riotous spirit proceeded from the obstinacy of the Lords; the opponents of the bill maintained that the people had been excited and driven mad in order that the bill might be carried, through a dread of their excesses. On the 20th of October, the king in person prorogued parliament. On his way to and from the House, his majesty was enthusiastically cheered by the multitude.

Rioting was not confined to London; it raged, with loss of life and property, at Derby and Nottingham. At the latter place the mob destroyed by fire the Castle, the splendid seat of the Duke of Newcastle. While the Reform Bill had been before the Lords for its second reading there had been a meeting of political unions at Birmingham; and, if that meeting did not terminate in an actual riot, it filled the minds of peaceable men with alarm, and it became the provocative and cause of riots elsewhere. The numbers that met were roughly estimated as forming a grand total of 150,000 persons. Reform members of the House of Commons presided and spoke. An address was voted to the king expressive of alarm at the awful consequences which might arise from the failure of the bill, and of indignation at the infatuation of the peers; and containing an earnest prayer that his majesty would forthwith create as many peers as would suffice to carry the bill. Coupled with vehement harangues and the proposition of anarchic resolutions, a vote of thanks was passed to Lord John Russell and Lord Althorpe. The answer returned to this vote of thanks, passed by an illegal and dangerous association, was far too courteous and encouraging; at least it might be interpreted as an encouragement offered by these two noblemen and ministers of the crown to the direct interference of the people with the legislature. And, assuredly, the ignorant populace, for some time, considered that they might

do as they list, provided what they did contributed, in any way, to terrify the enemies of reform, or to hasten the passing of the bill. Attacks had been made upon Lord Tankerville, upon the friends of Lord Ashley at Blandford, upon Lord Tenterden, and others. At Croydon the Archbishop of Canterbury was grossly insulted while presiding over a meeting for the propagation of the Gospel ; in Somersetshire the bishop of the diocese was rudely attacked while consecrating a new church. The Bishop of Exeter and other prelates were burned in effigy. But all these excesses were mere trifles compared with the devastation committed at Bristol, when, on Saturday the 29th of October, Sir Charles Wetherell arrived in that city to discharge his official duties as its recorder. Sir Charles, who had distinguished himself by the warmth of his opposition to the Reform Bill, was hissed, hooted, all along his road from Bath to Bristol. On entering Bristol, although he was surrounded by constables and by 300 or 400 respectable persons, he was assailed by yells, groans, and hisses, and his carriage was pelted with stones. Sir Charles, however, took his station on the bench at the Guildhall. With great difficulty the mob was kept out of that building by the constables. Having discharged his usual preliminary duties, the recorder adjourned the court till eight o'clock on Monday morning. Sir Charles remained in the Mansion House. For hours the constables were left alone to contend with the mob of 10,000 or more vagabonds, for it was Saturday, and the colliers and other labourers of the neighbourhood of Bristol, who had received their week's wages, had flocked into the town to get drunk and see the fun. Out of the mob which did all the mischief not one man in ten had come with any higher or better motive, or had any notion of the real meaning of the Reform Bill. When, at about half-past eleven o'clock, these motley fellows were full of drink, they began to talk of burning Sir Charles Wetherell out of the Mansion House ; but the foremost of them got their heads broken by the constables, and no farther mischief was done until *about* four o'clock in the afternoon, when the constabu-

lary force was permitted, or took permission, to retire to their homes for the purpose of refreshing themselves. Then, from gin-cellars and pot-houses and brothels, issued forth a mob full of bold daring. The mayor came forward to beg of them to depart, and to tell them that he should be very sorry to be compelled to read the Riot Act and call out the troops. It is said that shortly after this gentle admonition the mayor did read the Riot Act; but the mob, seeing nothing to oppose them except a few constables, rushed upon them, disarmed them, and beat them severely. Then followed a general attack on every part of the Mansion House, with a smashing-in of windows and shutters, and a breaking open of doors. At this critical moment Sir Charles put on a disguise and effected his retreat through the adjoining premises; but it was not made known until twelve o'clock on the following day (Sunday) that he had left the city. Materials had been collected for setting fire to the Mansion House; but that edifice was for the present saved from conflagration by the arrival of the troops. But Colonel Brereton, who displayed, all through this crisis, doubt, weakness, and vacillation, would not charge the mob, who greeted him with loud cheers and with a great show of cordiality. The soldiers merely trotted their horses backwards and forwards, and they too were cheered by the rioters, some of whom were heard saying that the troopers were just as anxious for the passing of the Reform Bill as they themselves were. For some hours the greater part of the multitude withdrew, or were quiet, or only shouted vengeance against the recorder. If the worshipful mayor, or any other magistrate, had assured them that Sir Charles was gone, there is no doubt that many of them would have gone quietly to their own homes. A little before the hour of midnight the public-houses, cellars, and dens vomited forth their inmates once more; fresh bodies of men, armed with bludgeons, crossed the bridges into the town; and then a concentrated attack was made upon the Council House. As they were smashing the windows and breaking open the doors, the soldiers, for the first time, rode upon them in earnest. Before this charge

the mob gave way at once, making a fearful noise, and running off by all the streets that were open to them. The soldiers followed, wounding a few of the fugitives, but striking more merely with the flats of their sabres. Some of the most determined of the rioters made a stand in alleys and narrow passages, whence they assailed the troopers with stones. A soldier, being severely hit, turned round upon a man and shot him dead upon the spot. This, we believe, was the first carbine or pistol that was fired. In a short time the whole mob vanished. The troopers continued to ride through the streets all night, to prevent the rioters from re-assembling.

On Sunday morning the troops, who had been more than twenty hours on duty, were withdrawn for some refreshment. Colonel Brereton seems to have thought that the rioters, most of whom were "black as the mine in which they wrought for bread," and just as brutally ignorant and devoid of all religion as Cowper's hard man, would respect the Lord's Day, or be calmed and sanctified by "the sound of the church-going bell," for he withdrew *all* his men at once, not leaving so much as a vidette. And no sooner were the soldiers gone than the rioters re-appeared and renewed their operations with greater fury than ever. Everything in the upper apartments of the Mansion House was destroyed in a trice. The people forced their way into the cellars, and then followed intoxication, wild drunkenness, raving madness ! The old and the young, and both sexes, were seen sharing in this precipitate debauch. The troops now returned ; but the mob, or that part of it which was drunk, was insensible to fear, and would not retreat. As the soldiers rode up they were greeted with showers of stones and other missiles ; and some of the rabble attempted to dismount them by throwing sticks and bludgeons between their horses' legs. At this critical moment, instead of ordering a charge, the commanding officer judged it prudent to withdraw the troops (the 14th Light Dragoons) and replace them with a body of the 3rd Dragoon Guards. *As the men of the 14th retired the mob shouted and followed them, pelting them with stones along the quay and*

over the drawbridge. At St. Augustin's Back the troopers, being provoked beyond further forbearance, drew rein, turned round, and shot several of their assailants. Still undeterred, the madder of the rioters continued their assaults until the 14th arrived at their quarters in the Boar's Head Yard, where the troops fired again. Immediately after these occurrences Colonel Brereton rode down to the square (the great scene of action and devastation), followed by many men and boys, who cheered him as a friend.

The mob, after a short pause, having procured sledgehammers from the blacksmiths' shops, and adzes and other tools from the ship-yards, broke into the New Gaol, liberated *all* the prisoners, and set fire to the building. Exclusive of debtors, above one hundred criminals—some of them convicts of the worst class—were let loose upon Bristol. During these proceedings, *twenty* troopers of the 3rd rode up—to see that they could do nothing against such a multitude. From the New Gaol the rioters proceeded to the three toll-houses, and burned them all. Then they moved off in two divisions, the one going to the Gloucester County Gaol, and the other to Bridewell. Having released all the prisoners, they set fire also to those two buildings.

It was now about eight o'clock of Sunday evening. The soldiers were suddenly called from the front of the Mansion House to protect the bishop's palace, to which some miscreants were applying their combustibles. The conflagration there was stayed for a time; but while the soldiers were at the palace the mob set the Mansion House all in a blaze, and before the troops could return to the spot the roof and whole front of that edifice came down with a tremendous crash, burying some of the mad rioters under the burning ruins. The troopers were called back to the bishop's palace, but before they could reach it the mob had done their work: the whole pile was speedily consumed. Happily the prelate had taken his departure from Bristol in the forenoon.

As midnight advanced, conflagration, outrage, and *ruin advanced with it*. The Custom House, with all the

back buildings in Little Queen Street, presented one immense mass of fire. Many of the drunken incendiaries were consumed in the flames they had themselves kindled. A small band, chiefly of boys and youths, who seemed to go about their employment as if they had been systematically trained to it, extended the conflagration, preceding their operations on each house by the giving of a short notice to the inmates to retire, and so escape being burned. In this manner they destroyed one whole side of Queen's Square, and then proceeded to another, commencing with the Excise Office at the corner. The antique church-towers of Bristol were now sounding the third hour after midnight. From this time the flames began to extend to the parallel streets and to some of the principal wine and spirit stores. The troops remained as quiet spectators. All the citizens were panic-stricken; few seemed to care for anything beyond their personal safety.

When Monday morning dawned upon Bristol the flames were subsiding; but the aspect of Queen's Square was truly appalling. Ruins, smoking ruins, on either side! Rioters lying dead-drunk, with countenances blackened by the smoke, and bestialized by their excesses! At *last* that was done which ought to have been done at *first*. The soldiers who had been ordered out of the city were brought back; and the magistrates, having re-assembled, came at length to a decision, and called out the whole *posse comitatus*. The military were then distinctly ordered by the civil power to act with all vigour, and clear the streets. This order was executed to the letter, and very speedily, by a party of the 14th, who had experienced such rough treatment the preceding day, and who, in consequence thereof, had fired upon the people. Wherever stones were handled, wherever resistance was offered, wherever the sound of the trumpet did not insure immediate dispersion, these troopers charged home, and cut down some of the *rioters*. The rabble poured off in torrents—men, women, and children running, screaming, shrieking, in every direction. It was seriously apprehended that some of the

desperadoes would set fire to the shipping crowded in the river. They might have done so on Sunday night, and have destroyed, together with a great part of the town and the warehoused property, an enormous amount of property afloat or in dry-dock ; but now, on Monday morning, proper precautions were taken to prevent such a catastrophe, and the shipping remained uninjured, untouched. By Monday afternoon (November 1st) a mournful tranquillity was restored to Bristol.

A riot so disgraceful and so destructive as this had not been known in England since the London No-Popery riots of 1780. Many cases of the wounded must have remained concealed ; but the total number of killed and wounded that were known did not exceed a hundred, of whom some were burned in the fires of their own lighting, and some died from excess of drink. About two hundred were taken prisoners during the outrages, and several individuals were afterwards captured with plundered property in their possession. Government allowed nearly two months to elapse before a special commission was appointed to try the offenders. Then eighty-one were convicted, and five left for execution, but only four suffered the extremity of the law. A military court of inquiry ordered that Colonel Brereton should be tried by court-martial. On the 13th of January, being the fourth day of his trial, the colonel shot himself through the heart. Another court-martial was held on Captain Warrington, senior officer of the 3rd Dragoon Guards. This officer's plea was that he had never received proper directions from Colonel Brereton, nor due assistance from the city magistrates. He said the head of those magistrates had purposely concealed himself when his presence was most needed ; and that all the aldermen had declined accompanying the soldiers, *because they could not ride on horseback*. General Sir Charles Dalbiac laid down on this occasion the following doctrine, as applicable to all such occasions, and as being a fundamental principle of the common law of England :—
“ That if the occasion demands immediate action, and *no opportunity is given for procuring the advice or*

sanction of the magistrate, it is the duty of every subject to act on his own responsibility in suppressing a riotous and tumultuous assembly; and in whatever is done by him honestly in the execution of that object he will be justified and supported by the common law; that law acknowledging no distinction here between the private citizen and the soldier, who is still a citizen, lying under the same obligation, and invested with the same authority, to preserve the king's peace as any other subject." This was the doctrine of the great Lord Mansfield, and is confirmed by the authority of the late excellent and humane Lord Chief Justice Sir N. Tindal. It was a doctrine upon which no doubt could be entertained by any man who understood Blackstone; but the writers of Radical newspapers, who had so long been inflaming the minds of the populace, and preaching the necessity of powerful demonstrations and the efficacy of street-warfare and of pikes, brazenly denounced the doctrine as contrary to English law and dangerous to the liberties of the subject.

Partial disturbances broke out at Bath, Coventry, and Leicester; but these, being properly opposed by the municipal and military powers, were speedily put down without bloodshed, and without any material injury to property. If the example of the mayor of Bristol and the unfortunate Colonel Brereton had been followed in these places, there would have been in them the same carnage and barbarous devastation.

On the 2nd of November, a royal proclamation was issued, exhorting all classes to unite in suppressing such tumults. Soon also it was found necessary to issue a proclamation against the political unions which had been formed for the sole purpose of forcing the acceptance of the Reform Bill. Birmingham was the great birth-place of these unions, but they had affiliated in London, Manchester, and other great towns. And they were threatening to become as formidable as the Jacobin societies had been in France. In London, the working classes had a *union of their own*, with officers named by themselves. In a printed paper calling a general meeting of the work-

ing classes, these London unionists demanded universal suffrage, annual parliaments, and vote by ballot, declaring at the same time that all men are born free and equal; that all hereditary distinctions of birth are unnatural, and opposed to the equal rights of man; and that they, for their own parts, would never be satisfied with any law or any reform which stopped short of these holy principles! This was going farther than those who had originally got up the unions either intended or anticipated; but such a system once set rolling among the people must always grow into monstrous proportions. Moreover, these London unionists invited their fellow-workmen in all parts of the country to meet for the same purpose, on the same day. They also told the working reformers "that union was strength, and that a general union of the labouring classes would be far stronger than any power that could be brought against it." While this paper was in circulation, government received information that sticks, bludgeons, and sword-sticks were in great demand in the market.

It seemed time to swear in special constables, to look after the London prisons, and to bring infantry, cavalry, and artillery round the city. This was done by Earl Grey's ministry. The meeting had been called for the 7th November, and was to have taken place at White Conduit House. On the 5th, the unionists were warned by the magistrates of Hatton Garden that the intended meeting would be illegal and seditious. Hereupon a deputation of the unionists went up to Lord Melbourne, the home secretary. His lordship admitted them to an interview, and told them, in his bland manner, that their printed declaration was not only highly seditious but perhaps treasonable, and that any person attending the meeting with the object for which it was professedly called would be guilty of an act of treason. The leaders then agreed to abandon the meeting; but no step was taken against them either for their seditious publication, or for their misdemeanour in calling such meeting; and the royal proclamation against the political

unions in general was not issued until the 22nd of December.

Not to interrupt the somewhat complicated narrative of the passing of the Reform Bill, we reserve for another place the foreign events of the year; merely noticing here, that 1831 was otherwise rendered memorable in England by the ravages of the cholera morbus, and by the ravings of Mr. Irving and his disciples in the unknown tongues. Altogether it was a very strange and a very turbulent year.

The parliament which had been prorogued on the 20th of October, 1831, was again assembled on the 6th of December. The bill had scarcely been negatived, when deputations of London reformers intruded themselves into the presence of Lord Grey, urging the necessity of not prolonging the prorogation beyond a week or two, and of immediately renewing the efforts to accomplish the same kind and measure of reform. Ministers themselves were pledged neither to propose, nor to accede to, any bill "less efficient" than the one which the Lords had just rejected. It was possible that they might consider something very different in kind to be equally efficient in its results; but to the ears of their supporters this language must have meant, that the same quantity of actual innovation was still to be enforced; and if so, then it was not easy to see how a different result could be anticipated in the House of Peers. The political unions, therefore, the reforming clubs, and the reforming journals, pressed upon the ministry, day and night, the necessity of constraining the king to create such a number of reforming peers as would render futile all opposition in the Upper House; and Lord Grey was told that if he hesitated to take this step he would be regarded and treated as a betrayer of that cause which alone had given him power, and had enabled him to retain it. It was taken for granted that the king, who was himself held forth as the great patron of the bill, was ready to secure its success by making the peers bend to the prerogative; or, if he should be reluctant, then, it

was plainly announced, the people would find means to bring both his majesty and the peers into a fitting temper of concession.*

On the 6th of December the king opened the session in person. The first allusion in the speech was to the one absorbing subject. His majesty read—"I feel it to be my duty, in the first place, to recommend to your most careful consideration the measures which will be proposed to you for a reform in the Commons House of Parliament; a speedy and satisfactory settlement of this question becomes daily of more pressing importance to the security of the state and to the contentment and welfare of my people."

More regrets were uttered about the disturbed state of Ireland. A systematic opposition had been made to the payment of tithes, attended in some instances, with afflicting results; it would therefore be one of the first duties of parliament to inquire whether it might not be possible to effect improvements in the laws regarding tithes. His majesty had the satisfaction to inform them that he had recently concluded with the King of the French a Convention for the effectual suppression of the African Slave Trade. This convention, having for its basis the concession of reciprocal rights, to be mutually exercised in specified latitudes and places, would, it was trusted, enable the naval forces of the two countries, by their combined efforts, to accomplish an object which was felt by both to be so important to the interests of humanity. Of the riots, the king said or read—"The scenes of violence and outrage which have occurred in the city of Bristol and in some other places, have caused me the deepest affliction. The authority of the laws must be vindicated, by the punishment of offences which have produced so extensive a destruction of property, and so melancholy a loss of life; but I think it right to direct your attention to the best means of improving the municipal police of the kingdom, for the more effectual protection of the public peace against a recurrence of

* Annual Register for 1832.

similar commotions." Nor could his majesty avoid speaking of those political unions which had been so menacing, and against which he had issued his proclamation :— "Sincerely attached to our free constitution, I never can sanction any interference with the legitimate exercise of those rights which secure to my people the privilege of discussing and making known their grievances; but, in respecting those rights, it is also my duty to prevent combinations, under whatever pretext, which, in their form and character, are incompatible with all regular government, and are equally opposed to the spirit and to the provisions of the law."

During the debate on the address in the Commons, Sir Charles Wetherell entered into some of the details of the Bristol outrages. He complained that he had been directly charged by the daily press as being himself the author of those disastrous events. These accusations against him had been promulgated in newspapers avowedly in connexion with the government; these papers had charged him with going to Bristol to exercise the functions of his judicial office against the remonstrances of his majesty's government, and of the magistrates of Bristol; yet every part of these statements so made, day after day, by papers in daily communication with the treasury, was base, false, and slanderous. How stood the facts? A deputation from Bristol, consisting of the sheriff and one of the aldermen, had waited on him in London, and had stated that the person of the recorder who, in the exercise of his official duties, should make a public entry into the city, would not, under the circumstances of the period, be safe. To such a height had the reformers carried their popular excitement that the person of a judge was not safe, because in his extrajudicial capacity he had opposed reform. He had inquired of the sheriff and alderman if they could not furnish a constabulary force adequate to the maintenance of the public peace; and they had given it as their opinion that a sufficient constabulary force could not be furnished. In consequence of this he desired them to wait upon the secretary for the home department. The deputation

accordingly waited on the noble secretary, and military assistance was furnished. He had absented himself from this interview in order that the noble secretary might put any inquiries to the sheriff and alderman of Bristol without the restriction which his presence might possibly have imposed. Subsequently the noble lord requested his attendance at the home office, and he did attend. Now, in the first instance, the information was conveyed to government that military assistance was requisite. On the second occasion it was arranged that everything should go on as usual; this was done in presence of some members of the cabinet, amongst whom, however, neither the noble lord (Althorpe) nor the right honourable gentleman opposite (Mr. Stanley) were numbered. Thus, if government thought that military co-operation was necessary, and that it was also necessary to suspend the usual gaol delivery, there existed two opportunities for declaring the facts, one in his (Sir C. W.'s) absence, the other in his presence. He had in his own mind discussed, whether by any mode the public ceremonial of his entry might be dispensed with, but he came to the conclusion that this was impossible. The noble secretary, he repeated, had agreed that all should go on as usual. Was not this, then, a flat contradiction of the charges which had been so flagitiously circulated against him? charges not merely kept up in the daily prints of London for a fortnight—not merely diffused throughout the country by the veins and arteries of the public press—but at last echoed in Paris by one of the prints there. It had been farther alleged, that he had proceeded to Bristol against the remonstrances of the magistrates, when they sent to Bath beseeching him not to come. This charge, like the other, was utterly unfounded. The magistrates themselves were abused for an irritating display of the military; whereas, in fact, the soldiers were not stationed in Bristol, but were placed under cover in the neighbourhood, and but for the interference of the political union their presence would not have been known to the people of the city. All unnecessary display of the military had been avoided by the judicious plans of the magistrates.

He would follow the example afforded by the royal speech, and abstain from going into the consideration of what had subsequently occurred, simply stating that he did not retire until the chief magistrate's feather-bed was taken from its accustomed depository, and used as a barricade for a window of the mansion-house hall. All the transactions of Sunday and Monday had taken place after his departure from Bristol. He conceived that, under the circumstances which he had laid before them, he might presume that in the eyes of that House he had exculpated himself. If any honourable member were of opinion that he had failed in doing so, he might reasonably demand, from the liberality, impartiality, honesty, and courage which ought to characterise every member of that House, on whatever side he sat, that he should rise up and tell him what other course he could have pursued. To what personal abuse would he not have been subjected by the many-tongued, foul-mouthed, and venomous press, if he had abstained from going to Bristol in consequence of threats of personal violence? The unions would loudly have declared that he was falsely imputing to them the fabrications of tumults, and of tumults directed against the administration of justice, which had never been contemplated; they would have pronounced it the falsehood of an anti-reformer, the mere invention of his own baseness, and would have stigmatised him as a coward who framed lying calumnies to shield his own pusillanimity. It had been said that the occurrences at Bristol did not spring out of reform, but had been perpetrated by delinquents ever ready to take advantage of any opportunity for plunder. He would not inquire at present how far these outrages were owing to the spirit which reformers had conjured up; he would only draw the notice of the House to a document by which the Bristol political union, a reform association, assumed to itself the power of deposing the magistrates and the recorder. This paper, which had been published on the 25th of October, set forth the surprise of the council at *the conduct* of the corporation in having called in the *assistance of the troops* for the purpose of conducting the

recorder into the city—a statement which was not true. It then stated, that if the magistrates found themselves incapable of maintaining the public peace without military aid, it was their duty to resign and allow the citizens to elect the municipal authorities. Who the electors were to be was not intimated; but here was an association telling the magistrates that they ought to resign rather than use the aid of the military for the preservation of the public peace. And this document, after recommending sedition, added a recommendation to the reformers to respect the public peace! He could not join in the applause given by the seconder of the address to government for the “promptitude” which they had displayed in appointing the special commission; and had that word been introduced into the address he must have moved an amendment. More than three weeks before the riots at Bristol he had called their attention to what had happened at Nottingham, and had stated that if persons were allowed to act on the principle of public vengeance there would be found to be but a slight partition-wall between Nottingham Castle and the house of any other anti-reformer. It was the duty of government to have issued a special commission at that period; but hitherto the Gazette was silent. Even in the commission which had been issued for Bristol, how came it that the magistrates, and he himself, the recorder, had been omitted? He had put in his claim to be included in it as a matter of right; he had asserted that claim before the home-secretary and likewise the lord chancellor. He would not charge the government with being influenced by the wish personally to degrade himself and the magistracy; but he would say that they had committed a grievous error in not including in the commission every person who was entitled by the charter of the city to assist at the gaol delivery; and all this was done to gratify the political unions, with one of which Lord John Russell had corresponded after it had adopted a resolution approximating closely to high treason. It was those opinions that had deposed the magistrates and recorder of Bristol. The only precedent in point to

sanction this proceeding had the name of Judge Jeffries attached to it—a name which did not use to rank very high in general estimation. While he agreed with that portion of the king's speech which stated that his majesty never could sanction any interference with the legitimate rights of the people to make known their grievances; yet, if the remainder of that portion were designed to apply to the Birmingham union alone, as the only association illegally constituted, he must pronounce the proposition to be equally ill-founded and ill-advised. The Bristol union was equally illegal; the associations which had declared hereditary rights unnatural, and the unions in London, from which Sir Francis Burdett had withdrawn his name, were equally illegal.

Amendments were proposed in the Upper House by Lord Harrowby, and in the Commons by Sir Robert Peel, on that part of the address which related to the affairs of Holland and Belgium. In his speech Sir Robert took occasion to express his thorough detestation of the violence and intimidation which had been resorted to in order to force the Reform Bill down the throats of the peers. He said, "Has there ever been in the whole history of the last century any period in which such effectual practical restrictions were imposed on the freedom of speech as have been imposed on it since the agitation of the question of Reform? Believe me, Sir, there are other tyrannies than those of individual despots? Who can deny their existence? Who can doubt their galling and oppressive character, after having seen the bitter and unrelenting animosity with which the populace have pursued many of those great and illustrious characters who acted the part of good subjects and honest men in the House of Lords? Can it be denied that it was not safe for those peers to travel home to their country-seats after the conscientious votes which they had given in defence of what they considered the true interests of the people of England? What system of government can that be in which you deny to your opponents the free exercise of judgment and of speech? You cannot propose changes extensive as those of your

Reform Bill without expecting, if you are reasonable men, that they will encounter opposition. You may denounce that opposition, you may visit it with confiscation, exile, death ; but so long as honour and courage exist among men—and in English bosoms I trust these qualities will find an eternal spring—you will not, you cannot, deter us from the expression of our honest opinions." Sir Robert, however, did not divide the House.

On the 12th of December Lord John Russell moved for leave to bring in a new Reform Bill, stating that the principles of the measure were to be the same as those of its predecessor. The alterations bore chiefly upon the process of disfranchisement and upon the qualification of electors. Within the last ten years there had been an increase of fifteen per cent. in the population of Great Britain, yet the preceding bill had proceeded upon the census of 1821. That very obvious objection was now got rid of by adopting the census of 1831. Sir Edward Sugden called the whole bill "a bill to encourage the growth of 10 $\frac{1}{2}$ houses in England." Sir Robert Peel hoped that the bill would undergo a great many more alterations before the House thought of passing it. The debates were long, but not very interesting. The House divided early on the morning of Sunday, the 18th, when the second reading of the new bill was carried by 326 against 162. The House then adjourned for the Christmas holydays. During those holydays, the cry was kept up by the journalists and by the political associations that the king must create more peers. His majesty's health was affected by his anxieties on this head.

A.D. 1832.—Parliament met again on the 17th of January, and the bill was at once pushed into committee, as the Reformers would allow of no delay. In committee its details were attacked by Mr. Croker, Sir Robert Peel, Mr. Vyvyan, and many others, who fell more particularly upon the clause which proposed to confer eight additional members on the metropolitan districts. It was urged that it would give to the capital a too preponderating in-

fluence over the rest of the country. The Marquess of Chandos moved an amendment against the clause ; but in a House of 552 members, he was out-voted by 80. The bill came out of committee about the middle of March, and on the 19th of that month Lord John Russell moved and carried the third reading by a majority of 116 in a House of 594. On the 23rd of March the bill was passed ; an amendment which went to raise the qualification to 20*l*. in Liverpool, and all new boroughs returning two members, having been negatived without a division.

On Monday, the 26th of March, the Reform Bill was carried up to the peers by Lords Russell and Althorpe, accompanied by an unusual number of members. Lords Harrowby and Wharncliffe, who had led the opposition in the Upper House last session, now announced their intention to vote for the reading of the bill. They were induced to this course by a desire to save the respectability of the House from a band of political agents formed into peers to serve the purpose of the moment. The Bishop of London was so impressed with the dangers hanging over the country, that he resolved to vote in the same way. The Duke of Wellington and the Marquess of Londonderry declared that their opinions were unchanged, and that they would oppose the bill as they had always done. The bill was read a first time that same day. The number of the waverers was increased by the report, industriously and most confidently spread, that his majesty had at last consented to create as many peers as Earl Grey might think necessary for carrying the bill. The Earl of Haddington, Lord Gage, and others followed the example of Lords Harrowby and Wharncliffe. Previously to the second reading, the Duke of Buckingham gave notice that if there should be, as he hoped and trusted there would be, a majority against this Reform Bill in their lordships' House, he would bring in, after the Easter recess, a bill for the purpose of giving members to large towns whose importance entitled them to be represented in parliament ; also for conjoining and consolidating certain boroughs, each of which returned now two members,

in order to make room for the new representatives, and prevent any man from being deprived of his existing rights ; whilst a third provision of his bill would be to extend the elective franchise, so as to prevent its abuse in boroughs. [My lord duke ! it was now " too late a week : " in November, 1830, a bill like this might have satisfied the people and have kept all things quiet ; but the people were now determined to have a great deal more.]

The second reading of the ministerial bill was moved by Earl Grey ; Lord Ellenborough immediately moved as an amendment, " that it be read a second time this day six months." This gave rise to a very animated debate. The Earl of Mansfield and the Duke of Wellington reprobated not the bill only, but the waverers also. A second adjournment took place. In opening the debate next day, the Earl of Winchelsea spoke with great indignation against a wholesale creation of peers, declaring, that if such a measure were adopted, he would no longer sit in the House, but would retire, and bide his time till the return of those good days which would enable him to vindicate the insulted laws of his country by bringing an unconstitutional minister before the bar of the peers. The debate was again adjourned. When it was resumed, Lord Durham, son-in-law of Earl Grey, made a long and vehement speech, pouring invectives upon the head of Dr. Philpott, bishop of Exeter, who had himself been guilty of much intemperance both in writing and in speaking against reform and its authors. Lord Durham attributed the expenses of the late war and that war itself to parliamentary corruption and profligacy. Reviving the exploded absurdities of many years ago, his lordship spoke as if we had willingly entered into a crusade against the French republicans, and as if England would have been left in the full enjoyment of peace, prosperity, and national honour, if she had not girded on the sword against France. At the end of this very long debate, at five o'clock in the morning, ministers divided the House, and found that they had then a majority of 9. The bill

having been read a second time was ordered to be committed.

The Lords broke up for the Easter holidays on the 17th of April, and the Commons the day following; but on the 16th the Duke of Wellington had entered on the journal of the Lords a protest against the second reading of the bill. This spirited protest, which dwelt more especially on the violation of chartered rights, and the introduction of an extraordinary degree of democratic influence, was signed by 74 other peers, including the Dukes of Cumberland and Gloucester, with 6 prelates. Lord Lyndhurst did not sign.

During the Easter recess, agitation was carried to its utmost limits. More monster meetings were called: the people of Leeds voted an address to his majesty, whom they designated "their sheet anchor, their refuge in the storm," imploring him to yield to *necessity*, and to create more peers. At Birmingham a special meeting of the political union was held on the 27th of April, when Thomas Attwood, esq., was again in the chair, and when a series of resolutions was agreed to; in consequence of which, a general meeting of all the political associations from surrounding districts in the counties of Warwick, Worcester, and Stafford, was convened for the 7th of May. On the appointed day, there was such an assemblage of people at the foot of Newhall Hill as this country had never before witnessed. The grand northern division alone was estimated at nearly 100,000. The procession extended along a line of four miles; upwards of 200 bands of music were in attendance, and more than 700 flags and banners waved over this heaving multitude. The commencement of proceedings was announced by the sound of a bugle; the orations delivered were trumpet-tongued, and were all in one tune; for these unionists were merciless to a minority, and would never listen to an opinion opposite to their own. A pepery petition to the House of Lords was very soon carried. They told their lordships, or, as they had it, they implored them, "not to drive to despair a high-minded, generous, and fearless people, or to urge them on, by a rejection

of their claims, to demands of a much more extensive nature, but rather to pass the Reform Bill into a law unimpaired in any of its great parts and provisions ; more especially uninjured in the clauses relating to the 10^l. franchise."

Other monster meetings were held at Liverpool, Manchester, Sheffield, Edinburgh, Glasgow, Paisley, Dundee, &c. &c., as well as in every great town in the South of England. Their petitions to the king all ran in the same key—more lords, and passing the whole bill ! The Edinburgh meeting was 80,000 strong. It was held in the king's park, near Holyrood House ; and from the windows of that palace the exile, Charles X., could gaze upon it. He had been terrified by the raging cholera which had gradually found its way from the banks of the Ganges to the Frith of Forth ; and he now apprehended that the revolution fever had much less gradually forced its way from Paris to old Edinburgh. The meeting, however, was very orderly. In the metropolis an extraordinary assembly of the members of the National Union took place on the 3rd of May, under the presidency of Joseph Hume, esq., M.P. The petition of this London meeting was very menacing : it told the Lords that if they rejected or mutilated the Reform Bill, "there was reason to expect that the payment of taxes would cease, that other obligations of society would be disregarded, and that the ultimate consequence might be the *utter extinction of the privileged orders.*"

It was four days after the concoction of this London petition to the peers, or on the 7th of May, that Parliament reassembled. The peers went at once into committee on the bill. When the House divided ministers were left in a minority of 35, the votes for an amendment, moved by Lord Lyndhurst, being 151, and those against it 116. Earl Grey then moved and carried that all farther consideration of the bill should be deferred till Thursday the 10th.

On Tuesday, the 8th, Earl Grey and my lord chancellor proceeded to Windsor to demand more peers or to tender their resignations. The king was nervous and

unsettled. He hesitated upon account of the great number of new peers requisite—he thought the anti-Reform peers very obstinate, very wrong, very wrong indeed—but he did not like making a dangerous precedent—the Lords would say that he had swamped their house—he was afraid he could not do it! In the end he desired till next day to deliberate. On the morning of the next day, Wednesday the 9th, it was intimated to ministers that his majesty had been pleased to accept their resignations.

This unlooked-for intelligence produced a new hurricane. In the Commons, Lord Ebrington gave notice of his intension to move an address to the king, on the perilous state of public affairs, next evening; and Lord Althorpe's well-meant liberal proposal that this motion should be postponed for a short time, to prevent any embarrassment in the formation of a new ministry, met with no acceptance in that agitated and stormy assembly. They would let the Tories know that if they would accept office, they must do it in defiance of that branch of the legislature which commanded the public purse. Accordingly Lord Ebrington's motion, being submitted to the House on the very next day, was carried by 288 against 208; and the following address was speedily carried and presented to the king:—"That it is humbly represented to his Majesty the deep regret felt by this House at the change which has been announced in his Majesty's councils, by the retirement of those ministers in whom this House continues to repose unabated confidence.

"That this House, in conformity with the recommendation contained in his Majesty's most gracious Speech from the Throne, has framed and sent up to the House of Lords a bill for a reform in the representation of the people, by which they are convinced that the prerogatives of the crown, the authority of both Houses of Parliament, the rights and liberties of the people, are equally secured."

In London the National Union met on the very *evening* of the day on which the king accepted the re-

signations ; and 1200 new members enrolled themselves at that meeting. On the morrow, there were 2000 more new members. It was unanimously resolved by these London unionists "That the betrayal of the people's cause was not attributed to Lord Grey, or his administration, but to the base and foul treachery of others ; that meetings be recommended in every county town and parish throughout the kingdom, which, by inducing compliance with the unanimous wishes of the people, may prevent the mischief that would otherwise result from the general indignation ; that a petition be presented to the House of Commons, praying the appointment of commissioners to receive the supplies ; and that, until the bill pass, they be not managed by the Lords of the Treasury." Resolutions to the same effect were voted by the common council and the livery of London. The liverymen went beyond all bounds. They heaped abuse upon the Duke of Wellington, upon the Sailor King himself, upon almost every body and every thing, but most of all upon the majority of the peers, whom they described as men who would gladly mix blood with corruption—as representatives of Dom Miguel of Portugal and Ferdinand the tyrant of Spain—as prototypes of Russian lords who regarded the people as serfs. The electors of Westminster met at the Crown and Anchor Tavern, where Sir Francis Burdett, who was in the chair, was eclipsed by the portly person and stormy eloquence of Daniel O'Connell. Similar meetings were held in Southwark and Paddington. At the latter place Mr. Joseph Hume harangued a congregation of 20,000 persons.

But the manufacturing Birmingham, which had become a speech-manufacturing place, was far hotter than the metropolis. Printed placards were stuck up in nearly all the shop windows—"NOTICE. No Taxes paid here until the Reform Bill is passed !" Great accessions of strength were made to the union of that place ; and there was another monster meeting at Newhall Hill, where a petition was voted to the Commons, containing, in addition to the common prayer to stop the supplies,

this ominous sentence:—"Your petitioners find it declared in the Bill of Rights, that the people of England may have arms for their defence suitable to their condition, and as allowed by law; and they apprehend that this great right will be enforced generally in order that the people may be prepared for any circumstances that may arise."

Manchester was not much behind Birmingham. Liverpool also had its meetings, its resolutions, and its menacing petitions. The political unions corresponded and fraternized with one another. In Scotland, and still more in Ireland, they talked of battles and wars, unless Earl Grey were speedily restored, and the bill, the whole bill, and nothing but the bill carried through the Lords and assented to by the king.

In the meanwhile the bewildered sovereign had sent for Lyndhurst, and had authorized him to adopt measures for the formation of a new ministry, declaring that there could be no basis for any ministry except upon the ground of "extensive reform." Lord Lyndhurst repaired forthwith to the Duke of Wellington, who was willing to make large sacrifices and encounter any degree of obloquy, if by so doing he could extricate his king from embarrassment. His grace desired no office, much less that of prime minister; yet, if necessary for the king's service, he was ready to serve in any way that might be thought fit. The premiership was then offered to Sir Robert Peel, but that cautious statesman refused it, as he felt he could be of no service to the king or to the country at that juncture, and as he was still decidedly opposed to any extensive alteration of the constitution. Men were found that were willing enough to fill the subordinate offices, but a premier could be found nowhere; and, on Tuesday, the 15th of May, Lord Lyndhurst was obliged to inform his majesty that the commission with which he had been intrusted had failed. Hereby the king was reduced to the humiliating necessity of calling back the discarded ministers.

On Friday, the 18th of May, the reinstatement of *Earl Grey* and his colleagues was certified in both

Houses. The fact, often disputed, is now notorious. The king, in recalling the reform ministry, had given Earl Grey *carte blanche*, or the power of making as many new peers as he might think necessary for his object. To prevent this swamping of the House the Duke of Wellington and about 100 conservative peers ceased their opposition and their attendance. After this the reformers had it all their own way.

On Monday, the 4th of June, Earl Grey moved the third reading of the bill in the Upper House. After a short but spirited struggle, the lord chancellor put the question; and, for some moments, it did not appear that the House intended to divide; but when the premier went on to move "that the bill do pass," Lord Roden remarked that the third reading had not yet been carried. A division, therefore, took place, and the numbers reported were, content 106, non-content 22. After a few verbal amendments had been made, the bill was passed and ordered back to the Commons, who agreed to the amendments of their lordships; and on the 7th of June the royal assent was given to the bill. There were also separate Reform Bills for Scotland and Ireland. These being carried through parliament, with little or no opposition, received the Royal Assent; the first, on the 3rd of August; the second, on the 7th of that month. Festivals and great rejoicings followed throughout the three kingdoms.

Parliament was prorogued by commission on the 16th of October. The registration of the new constituency, under the Reform Bill, was then rapidly proceeded with, and other necessary preparations were made for a new general election, which was rendered indispensable by the passing of the bill. On the 8th of December parliament was dissolved; and then began the election, the writs being made returnable on the 29th of January, 1833. Three parties took the field: the Ministerialists, or Earl Grey Whigs; the Tories, who now assumed the appellation of Conservatives; the Radicals, who were already dissatisfied, and were proclaiming that the Reform Bill did not go far enough, and must go farther, and that they

would have universal suffrage and vote by ballot, or wage an eternal war against all governments. Generally, in England and Scotland, the elections were favourable to the Ministerialists. Not so in Ireland, for there popular agitation was against them, and Mr. Daniel O'Connell had accused them, and continued to accuse them, of being guilty of injustice and insult towards the Irish.

We must now briefly advert to the affairs of Europe in which we were most interested. Dom Pedro having renounced the crown of Brazil in favour of his son, came over to Europe in 1831 to fight for the claims of his daughter, Donna Maria, to the throne of Portugal. He found great countenance from our Whig government, who now cast aside the principle of neutrality and non-interference, and who sanctioned armaments and expeditions fitted out in England, chiefly with English money and by English men, to an extent somewhat exceeding what the law of nations would justify. An English officer of distinction took the command of Dom Pedro's fleet, and manned it almost entirely with natives of this island. English military officers entered the Dom's service, recruited for him openly in London and Westminster, and elsewhere; and these recruits, armed and equipped, were sent off by hundreds to fight against the Miguelites and for the constitution which had found so little favour with the mass of the Portuguese population. Having collected his forces in the Azores, Dom Pedro sailed for Portugal on the 26th of June, 1832, with 80 vessels and nearly 8000 men, of whom the best and bravest were about 1200 English and French. He effected a landing, and with great ease took possession of Oporto; but he was soon shut up there by the Miguelites, who bombarded the town, blockaded the Douro, and placed the invaders in an unpleasant and critical situation. Provisions fell short, and not even constitutional sauce could reconcile the stomachs of the English to horse-flesh. In this state matters remained at the end of the year, the dulness of the scene being occasionally relieved by sorties and sharp conflicts outside the town.

There had been much discoursing about the propriety

and beauty of reviving the ancient Greek institutions, and of making an ultra-classical federal republic for that country; but, for evil or for good, Greece was now turned into a kingdom. In 1830 an offer of the crown of that country had been made to Prince Leopold Saxe-Coburg, who was born to be a king and could not help it. For some time the prince certainly entertained the notion of accepting what the Greeks offered; but he wavered as he made himself acquainted with the distracted state of the country, and the extreme, desperate spirit of the people; and, in the end, a most alarming, and yet most truthful letter from Count John Capo d'Istria, who was acting as a *protempore* president, decided him in the negative.* The effect of this letter was indeed galvanic. Capo d'Istria might not have been very willing to descend from the seat of eminence he occupied; but the picture he drew of the hardships to be endured by the first sovereign of liberated but anarchic Greece was not overcharged. Capo d'Istria was atrociously murdered on the 4th of October, 1831, at Nauplia, in open day, on the threshold of a church. His brother, Augustin Capo d'Istria, succeeded him in the presidency, but the distractions of the country and an active civil war obliged him to resign. The crown of Greece was sent a-begging. At last, the allied powers offered it to the King of Bavaria for his younger son Otho, then a minor; and, the offer being accepted, Otho, accompanied by a Bavarian council of regency and a body of Bavarian troops, arrived at Nauplia in February, 1833, and was willingly acknowledged by the Greeks as their sovereign. The government was to be a constitutional hereditary monarchy with a senate and a house of representatives. For a short time, there was something like tranquillity; but still many of the Greeks ceased not to be "robbers on land or pirates on the deep." The Bavarian soldiery, and Bavarian agents of

* See a very ill natured and very unfair article in the *Quarterly Review*, published at the time, and universally attributed to Lord Strangford.

police, were little to the taste of the Greeks; and a great many of those excitable, insubordinate men were led to conceive a dislike for their mild and well-intentioned young king.

The disseverance of Belgium from Holland, which had been brought about by popular insurrection and French propagandists, remained still a question which embarrassed all the cabinets of Europe. There seemed no chance, no possibility, and indeed (save on the part of Russia and Prussia) no wish, to enforce the arrangement which had been made at the Congress of Vienna, and for which Holland had, in various ways, paid a high price; but the Dutch troops had at least the satisfaction of giving one sound beating to the vapouring, boasting Belgians. The *Braves Belges*, who had conceited themselves into invincible heroes because they had made barricades and had carried on a successful street-and-house warfare against a very small force who were anxious not to injure the fair city of Brussels, ran away like a flock of sheep when they came to try their valour in the open field. This lesson was really needed, for, well nigh all over Europe, the populace had been given to believe that no regular troops could stand against them, and that they had only to make one good émeute to ensure a successful revolution. Brave old Chassé long kept the Dutch flag floating over the fortress of Antwerp; and there it would have floated to this day, if the striking of it down had depended solely on the Belgians.

In February, 1831, the Belgian congress had elected the Duke of Nemours to the throne of the new kingdom; but his father, Louis Philippe, King of the French, having refused the crown on the part of his son, a new election became necessary; and the choice fell upon Prince Leopold Saxe Cobourg. This time the prince did not hesitate; he quitted England, took the oaths prescribed, and ascended the throne on the 23rd of July, 1831, not quite three months before Capo d'Istria, the monitor who had warned him from the throne of Greece, came to his untimely and bloody end. The strong objections of Russia and Prussia were gradually removed; and on

the 15th of November, 1831, those two powers, in common with Great Britain, France, and Austria, recognized the independence of Belgium, and signed at London a treaty fixing the boundaries of the new kingdom. This was made a fearful rent in the grand treaty of Vienna.

In the summer of 1831 the rash, ill-conducted Polish revolution was extinguished in blood. The Poles had done well the single thing which they knew how to do—they had fought bravely; but, weak in numbers, wanting organization and the means of sustaining the war, wanting credit, and too many of them wanting common honesty, they could not but succumb. After two days' most desperate fighting, Warsaw capitulated on the 7th of September, 1831, and was taken possession of by the Russians. Europe remained as an inactive spectatress of the struggle. In England as well as in France, the liberals would fain have made common cause with the Polish patriots. The French talked the loudest and did the least. The English sent money and clothes, and when the *debacle* came, and when the streets of London were crowded by utterly desperate or destitute Polish refugees, they were fed and supported by our government and people. We forgot in the hour of misfortune the stanch adherence of these Poles to Bonaparte, and the ferocity of the Polish lancers, of which we had tasted the bitter fruits in Portugal, in Spain, and at Waterloo. The Emperor Nicholas exercised the utmost severity against the patriotic portion of the people; for, after all, the patriots were only a portion, and scarcely the major portion, of the nation. Many individuals who had taken part in the insurrection were either condemned to the mines of Siberia, or sent to serve as soldiers in the harassing destructive war of the Caucasus. Men of the noblest birth, and once of the greatest fortunes, were made to undergo these punishments. The constitution was formally abrogated, and another form of government, called the "organic statute," imposed under the Russian bayonet. The universities of Warsaw and Vilna, together with many minor schools,

were abolished, and the public libraries and museums were carried away to Russia. Almost every possible measure was adopted which tended to destroy the nationality of Poland.

The French had found that they had not increased their liberty by the revolution of 1830. The country had been in a most troubled state ever since that period: trade and industry had wofully declined, and the hunger of the stomach had increased the desperation of the heart and brain. To plots and conspiracies there had been no end. There had been riots and street-fights in Paris, and a fierce civil war at Lyons, with a terrible loss of human life. In 1831 Marshal Soult had not been able to reduce that city to order with less than 26,000 men, and a tremendous train of artillery. In the course of the year upon which we are about to enter, Lyons was again the scene of civil war, carnage, and anarchy; and also in the course of that troublous year, Louis Philippe made greater inroads upon the liberty of the press and upon the personal liberty of the subject than had ever been attempted or contemplated by Charles X. and his expelled government. Old Lafayette had told the French people that they would find in Louis Philippe the best of republics; but Lafayette was always wrong—they really found in Louis Philippe a powerful and adroit master who could and who *would* rule them; by the charter if they could be brought to be quiet, despotically otherwise.

A.D. 1833.—Mr. Manners Sutton had announced his intention of retiring from his post as Speaker of the Commons, which he had now occupied during sixteen years. An Act had been passed granting him a pension of 4000*l.* per annum, with a reversion of 3000*l.* to his son; but he had not yet been advanced to the peerage. Ministers apprehending that the Reform Bill would send them a good many inexperienced and disorderly members, wished him to remain at his post, by doing which there would be a present saving of 4000*l.* per annum. The more violent reformers resolved to oppose his re-election, *on the score* of his conservative politics. When parlia-

ment met on the 29th of January, Mr. Hume moved that Mr. Littleton, one of the members for Staffordshire, should occupy the chair; considering it a matter of the highest importance that the reformed parliament should have a reformer for speaker, or that the speaker should concur generally in the political sentiments entertained by members. He was seconded by Mr. O'Connell, who again rated ministers roundly; but, as only 31 divided with Mr. Hume, and 241 voted against him, Mr. Manners Sutton remained as speaker.

On the 5th of February the king in person opened the first session of the new reformed parliament. A great part of the royal speech was occupied by the terrible disturbances in Ireland, and by the paramount necessity of immediately adopting measures for repressing them; for controlling and punishing the disturbers of the public peace, and for preserving and strengthening the legislative union between the two countries,—“which union,” said his majesty, emphatically, “with your support, and under the blessings of Divine Providence, I am determined to maintain by all the measures in my power, as indissolubly connected with the peace, security, and welfare of my people.” This roused the fury of Mr. Daniel O'Connell. In the debate on the address, which re-echoed his majesty's sentiments, he called the whole address a bloody, brutal, and unconstitutional document—a declaration of civil war—such a declaration as England once put forth against America, though she reaped from it nothing but discomfiture and disgrace. After seven centuries of oppression there was still to be a call for blood in Ireland! If after so long a lapse of time, during which Ireland had been subject to England, Ireland—a territory so blessed by Providence, but so cursed by man—was still in a state of wretchedness and misery, the governors, the English governors, alone were to blame. The Irish people were and ever had been innocent and blameless. True it was that deeds of violence and crime had increased in that beautiful country; but why had they increased? The mover of the address had ascribed the increase to agitation; but he, and the

other friends of ministers, seemed to have forgotten *that it was only last year they themselves had been reproached as agitators, exciting the people to support changes and innovations which the people did not originally desire or care for!* When he and his friends had most agitated Ireland for emancipation, tranquillity had most prevailed. The Whigs had been riding rough-shod over Ireland; increase of crime had always followed, and always would follow, increase of force and violence. Never had there been such a prosecuting government as the present! They had prosecuted the press, the people, and even the priests of Ireland; but had done nothing to restore tranquillity to the country. So long as Ireland had grievances to complain of, he would agitate to redress them. This was what Englishmen had done to achieve reform. An unreformed parliament had passed two acts relative to Ireland which even an Algerine government would not have sanctioned. A reformed parliament, it appeared, was now to be called on to pass another, to put an end to agitation; but he would tell them it would be many and many a day before they could frame an act capable of effecting their object.

The debate was carried on by adjournments four days, or to the 8th of February, when Mr. O'Connell's amendment, for a committee of the whole House on the address, was rejected by 428 against 40.

A coercion bill for the suppression of disturbances in Ireland was introduced into the House of Lords by Earl Grey, and was there carried without opposition. But long and loud and fierce was the opposition it met with in the Commons from O'Connell and his well-jointed tail. Some of these Irish members did not hesitate to say in private that the coercion bill was absolutely and immediately necessary. One of the chief of them said, in the hearing of several members of the House,—“*We, as Irish patriots and members, must oppose the bill to the utmost; but if you do not pass it, by heavens there will be no security for property or for life in Ireland!*” Words to this effect being subsequently repeated, created a hurricane which will not soon be forgotten. Mr.

Matthew Davenport Hill, one of the members for Hull, who had first disclosed this precious specimen of Irish sincerity, received a batch of challenges, being challenged by nearly one-half of the members of the O'Connell tail; and *only* Lord Althorpe stood forward like a man of honour, like an English gentleman, to the rescue of Mr. Hill in the House of Commons.

At last, on the 29th of March, the bill being slightly altered in the Commons, was read a third time and passed. Mr. Stanley now resigned the uneasy office of secretary for Ireland, and was succeeded by Sir John Cam Hobhouse. Mr. Stanley became secretary for the colonies, that place being vacated by Viscount Goderich, who was made lord privy seal and advanced in the peerage by the title of Earl of Ripon.

Concurrent with the Irish coercion bill, measures of redress and improvement for that country were introduced. The total revenues of the Irish Protestant church amounted to about 800,000*l.* per annum—a sum of course entirely absorbed by the Protestant churchmen. On these funds it was the intention of ministers, after abolishing first-fruits, to impose a tax, varying according to the value of livings and bishoprics from 5 to 15 per cent.; from the operation of which, however, livings under 200*l.* per annum were to be exempted; while the larger revenues of the primate and the Bishop of Derry were to be reduced respectively to the amount of 10,000*l.* and 8000*l.* a-year. The sum collected by this tax would be applied under commissioners to the abolition of church cess; the augmentation of poor livings and building of glebe houses; the division of unions; and the erection of churches. With respect to the offices of deans and chapters, it was proposed, wherever they were unconnected with the cure of souls, to abolish them altogether, or attach them to such cure. With regard to livings where no duty had been done for the last three years, it was proposed to suspend the appointment of ministers at the discretion of the church commissioners. It was also proposed to abolish ten bishoprics, and annex the vacated sees to certain of those that were preserved. Lastly

came the lands attached to bishoprics ; and here the chancellor of the exchequer, Lord Althorpe, laid down this principle—"That if by the act of parliament to be introduced any new value was given to benefices, that new value, not belonging properly to the church, might be immediately appropriated to the exigences of the state ; he believed that 500,000*l.* a-year was the value of all Irish episcopal lands to the lessees or tenants, though the bishops did not receive much more than 100,000*l.* ; by a different mode of granting leases, his lordship showed that a sum of near 300,000*l.* might be acquired for the state without any diminution of income to the bishops ; and he concluded with moving for leave to bring in a bill to alter and amend the laws relating to the established church in Ireland.

This scheme gave great dissatisfaction to two parties—to the zealous Protestants and Conservative members of opposition, who detested its principle as being destructive to the interest of the church ; and to the economists, radicals, and repealers, in whose opinion it left far too much of the church property untouched. Sir Robert Inglis stigmatized the measure as tending to the total destruction of the Protestant religion in Ireland. Some alterations were made in the bill, which was read a third time on the 6th of July, and passed by a majority of 274 to 94. Being sent up to the Lords, it there encountered considerable opposition, and was subjected to several alterations. Their lordships finally passed it on the 30th of July, the contents being 135, the non-contents 81. On the 2nd of August the Commons agreed to the amendments of the Lords, Mr. O'Connell observing that their lordships had not made the bill much worse than they found it, and protesting against its being considered in any other light than as the first trifling instalment of the enormous debt due to Ireland.

For a long time there had been no collecting tithes in Ireland without a riot—in many cases they could not be collected at all. A resolution was now passed for exchequer bills not exceeding 1,000,000*l.* to be issued for advancing, under certain conditions, arrears of tithes due

for 1831 and 1832, subject to a deduction of 25 per cent., and the value of tithes for 1833, subject to a deduction of 15 per cent., to any person entitled to such arrears or tithes, and desirous of receiving such advances. The amount advanced was to be included in the tithe composition, so as to be repaid in the course of five years by half-yearly instalments. Many people now said that England, besides paying its own tithe, would have to pay the Irish tithe also. Two commissions were issued, one for inquiring into the corporations of Ireland, and the other for investigating the condition of its labouring classes.

During this session the last blow was given to negro slavery in the West Indies, an Act being passed for the total extinction of slavery in the British colonies by the 1st of August, 1834. As a compensation to the proprietors of slaves the immense sum of 20,000,000*l.* of the public money was readily voted. Lest the emancipated slaves should relapse into indolence and utter barbarity, it was provided that every negro should, immediately on his emancipation, become an apprentice to his late master for a period not exceeding six years, under an obligation of working for his master forty-five hours in the week. It was thought that by this arrangement a moderate supply of labour would be insured to the planter.

In renewing the Bank of England Charter some important alterations were made in it by ministers and parliament. These changes included a monthly publication of the bank accounts, the repayment of a portion of its capital, a partial repeal of the usury laws which impeded its action, an annual payment of 120,000*l.* in return for privileges now conceded, its notes made a legal tender (except at the bank itself or its branches), a quarterly return of the amount of circulation of all other banks, and certain regulations for the improvement of joint-stock banks, among which was the power of obtaining a charter from the crown.

In renewing the East India Company's Charter most important and radical alterations were made. The trade, as well of India as China, which the Company had mo-

nopolized for centuries, was thrown entirely open. The merchant princes ceased to be merchants—they remained as lords of the soil. Some judicious changes were made in the constitution of the board of control, and every office under the Company has been thrown open to British subjects without distinction. This was bold legislation, and it now appears to be universally acknowledged to have been as good and wise as it was bold. Other advances were made in the system of free trade. A free trade or commercial commission was sent over to France; but it could do no good there, the French conceiving that we were laying snares for their simplicity and innocence.

Laudable efforts were made to ascertain the actual condition of our labouring classes, with a view of improving it. The Factory Bill was elaborately discussed; and an Act was passed, which not only reduced the daily labour of children, but made provision for their education.

A reduction of taxation was made to the amount of 1,545,000*l.*; but this economy was rather injurious to our naval service.

As a continuance or completion of reform, the borough system was altered, a sweeping corporation reform being prepared for England and for Scotland. All the evils of an irresponsible monopoly of municipal legislation were however left in Ireland.

Violent attacks were made upon the Church of England by some of the radicals who had been elected to the first reformed parliament. A Mr. Faithfull, from Brighton, proposed a wholesale seizure or confiscation of church property. He was seconded by Mr. Cobbett, but supported by no one else.

The Jews were now the only class of the community whose religion affected their rights as citizens. Mr. Grant brought in a bill to relieve them from all civil disabilities. It passed the Commons, but was thrown out, on the second reading, by the Lords.

The king in person prorogued parliament on the 29th of August. His majesty regretted that he could not yet

announce the conclusion of a definitive arrangement between Holland and Belgium. Events which had lately taken place in Portugal had induced him to renew his diplomatic relations with that kingdom. He hoped that the recent Bank arrangements would sustain public credit and secure the usefulness of that important establishment.

“ I observe with satisfaction,” said his majesty, “ that the amendment of the law has continued to occupy your attention, and that several important measures have been adopted, by some of which the titles to property have been rendered more secure and the conveyance of it more easy ; while, by others, the proceedings in courts, both of law and equity, have been made more expeditious and less costly. The establishment of the Court of Privy Council is another improvement, which, while it materially assists suitors at home, will, I trust, afford substantial relief to those in foreign possessions.

“ You may rest assured that there is no part of your labours which I regard with a deeper interest than that which tends, by well-considered amendments of the law, to make justice easily accessible to all of my subjects.

“ With this view I have caused a commission to be issued for digesting into one body the enactments of the criminal law, and for inquiring how far, and by what means, a similar process may be extended to the other branches of our jurisprudence. I have also directed commissions to be issued for investigating the state of the municipal corporations throughout the United Kingdom.

“ The result of their inquiries will enable you to mature those means which may seem best fitted to place the internal government of corporate cities and towns upon a solid foundation, in respect of their finances, their judicature, and their police. In the meantime two important acts have been passed for giving constitutions upon sound principles to the royal and parliamentary burghs of Scotland ; and your attention will hereafter be called to the expediency of extending similar advantages to the unincorporated towns in England which have now acquired the right of returning members to parliament.”

On the 29th of September, an apoplectic fit terminated the life of Ferdinand VII. of Spain. His infant daughter was proclaimed queen, with her mother for regent. The regent was compelled to throw herself into the arms of the constitutionalists and anti-church party. The priests, the monks, and all the ultra-royalists, declared that by the Salic Law, which had been established in Spain at the accession of the Bourbon dynasty, a female could not reign ; and that, consequently, the crown devolved to the late king's brother, Don Carlos. Another interminable civil war commenced forthwith.

In Portugal, Dom Pedro's efforts had been crowned with success. Being reinforced by the arrival of more foreign adventurers, chiefly English and French, he succeeded in driving away the Miguelites, and putting an end to their blockade of Oporto about the middle of April. The fleet, under the command of Sartorius, had fought one or two actions, but had never been paid. Dom Pedro, moreover, had treated the English commander with great coolness. This led to a violent and dangerous quarrel. Dom Pedro sent to put Sartorius under arrest ; Sartorius threatened to blockade the regent in Oporto, and appeared with his ships before that town. After some long negotiations, means were found to satisfy Sartorius's claims so far that he consented to give up the command of the fleet. He was replaced, in the beginning of June, by another British officer, Captain Charles Napier. On the 21st of June, the regent sailed from Oporto with 2500 men for the Algarves, the most southern province of the kingdom. His landing there was unopposed. On the 25th of June he marched into the city of Tavira. On the 27th he took possession of Faro, and on the 29th he was at Lagos. He was well received by the people, and his daughter the queen was proclaimed amidst acclamations. In less than a week Dom Miguel had the mortification of hearing that the whole province of Algarves was lost to him. But a still heavier blow awaited him. On the 5th of July, Admiral Napier, with a very inferior force, annihilated the Miguelite squadron off Cape St. Vincent. Dom Miguel had now only the land to trust

to. He had put at the head of his army the Bourbon royalist, Marshal Bourmont, who had been, in 1830, the conqueror of Algiers, but who was now in disgrace, and an exile from his country. The Duke of Terceira, with the forces of Dom Pedro or Donna Maria, moved from the Algarves upon Lisbon. On the 23rd of July, in approaching the left bank of the Tagus, he came in contact with a Miguelite force, commanded by Telles Jordao. The battle was brief, and the victory complete. The Miguelites, instead of making preparations for defence, evacuated Lisbon a night or two after this battle. The Duke of Terceira was received in the capital with transports of joy by the constitutionalists, who, before his arrival, had proclaimed "the Senhora Donna Maria II., daughter of the immortal Pedro IV." Admiral Napier came up the Tagus with his victorious squadron; and now the Miguelites and the priests and monks were scampering off in all directions to seek for hiding-places, just as the constitutionalists had been obliged to do when they were the losing party.

While these decisive events were taking place in the south, Marshal Bourmont was endeavouring to drive the Pedroites out of Oporto. He made a terrible attack on the 25th of July, but was finally obliged to retire, after having suffered a very considerable loss. Bourmont was obliged to go and look after the Duke of Terceira, who had taken post at Villa Franca, a little to the north of the capital. The French Marshal concentrated his forces at Coimbra, on the road to Lisbon. The system of defence adopted by the constitutionalists was to protect the capital by a strong chain of works, extending to the old lines of Torres Vedras, where the Duke of Wellington had so successfully kept the French at bay. The Miguelites might break their force against these bulwarks; and the Pedroites might harass them with sorties as opportunities offered, and as new troops and volunteers came in. The position of the Miguelites still kept at their command the northern and eastern provinces; and even when they had withdrawn from the Douro, there was no popular movement in that part of the country in favour of the

queen. In sober truth, the common people, in nearly every part of the kingdom, were averse or indifferent to her cause and to the constitution. In the meanwhile that young sovereign, who had been acknowledged both by England and by France, had made a triumphant entrance into Lisbon, where her father, Dom Pedro, was holding the reins of government in her name. An English ambassador was at once appointed.

After some not very spirited fighting, the Miguelites retreated up the right bank of the Tagus, safely carrying off all their baggage and artillery. The last operation of the year terminated favourably for Dom Miguel. On the 2nd of November, a detachment of his army gave the constitutionalists a sound beating at Alverca. These constitutionalists being for the most part volunteers, ran away at the beginning, shamefully abandoning some of Napier's English marines. Upon finding themselves surrounded in their retreat, a great number of these volunteers went over to the enemy shouting for Dom Miguel.

Dom Pedro could make constitutions—such as they were—but he would not himself observe them when they were made. His acts, in many instances, were quite as despotic as any which had proceeded from his brother. He quarrelled with the Marquess Palmella, who was almost the only man of real talent in his service, and recalled him from his embassy at London. He introduced into the government men without name, character, or even party influence. By a decree he sanctioned an act of spoliation of the greater part of the landed proprietors in Portugal. In contempt of the liberty of the press, which was a component part of the constitution, he arbitrarily arrested a peer of the realm, who, in a printed letter, had spoken freely of the unwise acts of the government. The printer of the letter was also arrested in a manner contrary to law.

The Ottoman empire was again in jeopardy; the throne of the Sultan being first menaced by a satrap, Mehemed Ali, the Pasha of Egypt; and next endangered by an insidious protecting ally, Nicholas, the Tzar of

Russia. The victories of Ibrahim Pasha, during the preceding year, had opened to him the passes of Mount Taurus and the road through Asia Minor to Constantinople. On the 21st of December, 1832, Ibrahim had defeated the Grand Vizier at Koniah, and had taken almost the whole of the artillery, baggage, and ammunition of the Turks. Between Koniah and Constantinople there was nothing to withstand the Egyptians and Arabs. Ibrahim advanced to Brusa, at the foot of the Bithynian Olympus, and at the distance of not more than three forced marches from Constantinople. Russia could furnish, from the neighbouring ports of the Black Sea, the most prompt and substantial assistance; Russia could send the Sultan troops, when France and England could only send ambassadors; and Russia was longing for the moment when despair would compel the Ottoman Porte to throw itself into her arms: this, again, was precisely the state of things which England, France, and Austria were anxious to avert; for it suited not the views and interests of any one of these powers that the Russians should get a firm footing in European Turkey, or that Turkey should become, in everything but in name, a mere dependancy of the Russian empire. So urgent, however, was the Sultan's case, that before the diplomacy of Europe could be set in motion, he was obliged to apply to Russia for assistance both by sea and land; and a fleet from Sebastopol anchored at the entrance of the Bosphorus, on the 20th of February, 1833, to defend the narrow passage from Asia into Europe. The arrival of this Russian force excited the jealousy and alarm of Admiral Roussin, the French Ambassador at the Porte, who insisted strongly that the fleet should be immediately sent back. Having failed in this, Admiral Roussin made himself the principal party in framing a treaty of peace, which was to be sent to Mehemed Ali, together with an assurance that he must accept it or expect to see the combined French and English fleets hostilely arrayed against him on the coast of Egypt. Admiral Roussin's treaty would have left the Pasha of Egypt in possession of St. Jean de Acre, Jerusalem, and Tripoli, in Syria. The Pasha demanded the

whole of Syria, with the adjoining district of Adana, which would have brought his territories up to the very foot of Mount Taurus; he positively refused to accede to the treaty, and he sent orders to Ibrahim to continue his advance. Constantinople was in dismay—the Sultan again applied to Russia for more ships, and for troops. Before the end of April 15,000 Russians were landed at Scutari, the Asiatic suburb of Constantinople, and were encamped between the army of Ibrahim Pasha and the Bosphorus. The Russian fleet guarded the Bosphorus itself; thus completely stopping the passage to Ibrahim, who had no ships, and no possibility of obtaining any. A much more numerous Russian army was marching up from the Danube. It was not the interest of Russia that Ibrahim, by receding from his demands, or the Sultan by granting, should shorten the duration of her protectorate. It was the interest of the other powers that every pretext for the presence of the Russians should be speedily removed. Sultan Mahmoud wavered as one party or the other made their strong representations to him. The wishes, however, to get rid of Ibrahim Pasha and the Tzar Nicholas induced him to grant to Mehemed Ali part of his additional demands. M. Varennes, of the French legation, was authorized to proceed to the Egyptian head-quarters and concede the Pashalic of Aleppo. Ibrahim, however, insisted immoveably on receiving likewise the district of Adana. The Sultan at last found it prudent to comply. Military operations in Asia Minor between the Russians and the Egyptians would have thrown him more completely into the power of the Tzar. On the 5th of May, he gave up Adana, along with the whole of Syria. On the conclusion of this peace Ibrahim began his retrograde movement. By the end of July he had recrossed Mount Taurus. So soon as it was known that he had quitted Asia Minor the Russian troops and ships likewise took their departure. The march from the Danube had already been countermanded. Shortly after this the Sultan was led into the dangerous and disgraceful treaty of Hunkiar-Iskellisi. By this treaty *the Tzar was to aid the Sultan in repressing all future dis-*

turbances, and the Sultan, at the demand of the Tzar, in particular circumstances, was to shut the passage of the Dardanelles against the ships of all other nations. England and France complained that such a treaty should have been concluded without their concurrence, and each of them had a fleet at the time near the Dardanelles ; but their remonstrances were unheeded, and their fleets returned. They had, in fact, been blaming the Sultan for faults of their own commission or omission. They had sent him no aid ; they had stood aloof at the moment of crisis ; and they had left the Porte nothing to do but to throw itself into the arms of Russia. If a British fleet had been sent up the Dardanelles and to the Bosphorus in the month of January, the Sultan would have had no need of the Russians, and Ibrahim would have suspended his march upon Constantinople. If a combined French and English fleet, or a fleet of either nation singly, had appeared off the Egyptian coast at the opening of the year, the Pasha would have recalled his conquering son. But our ministers had promised a reduction of taxes, and were led to reduce the navy at a time when they ought to have strengthened it. Perhaps, too, they had little reliance on the sincerity and steadiness of the French cabinet.

The free states of South America continued to demonstrate how little they were fitted for the enjoyment of freedom, and how slow they were to learn the first principles of government. They were nearly all rent by conspiracies, insurrections, and intestine warfare.

A.D. 1834.—His majesty opened the session on the 4th of January. A war of succession was raging, and was likely long to rage, in Spain ; but his majesty intimated that, immediately on the death of the late king he had recognised the succession of his infant daughter. In the debates on the address, the foreign policy of government was particularly attacked by the Duke of Wellington. To the risk of the repose of Europe, Holland and Belgium stood in the same situation now as they did two years ago. In Portugal the war was notoriously carried on by the subjects and with the capital of this country,

yet the king of Spain had been told, "in this contest you must be neutral; and if you are not, we will interfere and support Dom Pedro." Under the protection of our fleets in the Douro and the Tagus, our boasted neutrality had been shamefully violated. In Spain King Ferdinand thought proper to make an alteration in the succession to the crown, and Don Carlos was expelled. Don Carlos was required to retire to Italy. He refused, but he went to Portugal to seek assistance there, so that, in fact, the civil war in Spain grew out of the civil war in Portugal which was fomented by us. He had formerly ventured to advise the government to issue a proclamation recalling his majesty's subjects from the service of both parties; but his advice had been disregarded. In the East, too, a most unfortunate line of policy had been adopted. Why had Ibrahim Pasha been allowed to overrun the dominions of the Sultan? On a former occasion, when the Pasha of Egypt was desired by this government not to carry into execution certain measures which he wished to effect, and when he was positively told that he must not proceed, he at once desisted. If this country wished to prevent him from carrying on war, we needed only to have a fleet there. If in 1832 or 1833 our ministers had plainly told Mehemed Ali that he was not to carry on hostile operations against the Sultan, they would have put an end to the war. But, instead of taking a commanding position in the Levant, our fleets were in the Douro and the Tagus protecting civil war, and in the Channel blockading the fleets of the Dutch, because that ill-used people would not yield to every demand made upon them by the Belgians. The consequence was, that our old allies, Holland, Portugal, Spain, and Turkey were placed under the protection of other powers.

Ever since the passing of the Catholic emancipation, Ireland had been agitated for a repeal of the union. On the 22nd of April, Mr. O'Connell rose in the House of Commons, and moved in form that the union should be abolished. The agitator was well answered by Mr. Spring Rice and Sir Robert Peel. Sir Robert repeated

the well-known exclamation of Mr. Canning : " Repeal the union ! Re-enact the heptarchy ! " The security of the empire depended on the maintenance of that union, without which England would be reduced to the condition of a third-rate power, and Ireland to the desolation of a wilderness. Only 38 were found to vote for O'Connell, while 523 voted against him. With a single exception the minority consisted of Irish members.

A most disproportionate share of the time of parliament continued to be taken up with Irish affairs, and the harangues and quarrels, and mutual recriminations of Irish members. The government was guilty of the folly of yielding too much to the demands of these impatient long-tongued men. This led to dissensions in the cabinet. It was demanded that the Protestant establishment in Ireland should depend on the comparative strength or weakness of the Romish Church ; and Mr. Ward made a motion for reducing the temporalities of the Protestant establishment as far exceeding the spiritual wants of the Protestant population. Ministers tried to get rid of the proposal by appointing a commission to inquire into the state of the Irish Church. This expedient necessarily implied that, if facts turned out in a particular way, the cabinet would no longer oppose Mr. Ward's principles, and an attack would be made on all church property in Ireland. With this conviction Mr. Stanley, Sir James Graham, the Duke of Richmond, and the Earl of Ripon resigned office. Their places were soon filled up : the Marquess of Conyngham became postmaster-general, and the Earl of Carlisle privy seal ; Lord Auckland succeeded Sir James Graham at the Admiralty, and Mr. Spring Rice succeeded Mr. Stanley in the Colonial Office. Mr. Abercromby and Mr. Cutler Ferguson, who had not previously held office, were appointed respectively master of the mint and judge advocate ; and Mr. Poulett Thomson was now made president instead of vice-president of the Board of Trade.

While the cabinet was thus shaken and weakened by internal dissensions, publicity was given to a decla-

ration made by the king to the Irish prelates—a declaration by no means favourable to an attack upon the church. Lord Althorpe informed the Commons that a lay commission had been appointed to inquire into the whole state of church property and church affairs throughout Ireland; also into those of Roman Catholics and dissenters; into the number of schools in each parish, the different religious persuasions of those that attended them, &c. Ministers would not have advised the crown to adopt such a measure as this, without being prepared to act on the report of the commission, as circumstances should point out, and as the information procured by the said commission should warrant. Accordingly Lord Althorpe trusted that Mr. Ward, satisfied with what government had done, would withdraw his motion. Mr. Ward refused so to do, saying, he was afraid that the present ministers would not long continue in office; and that if they were removed, the commission would be inoperative. Lord Althorpe then moved the previous question, and carried it by 396 against 120.

The O'Connellites now called for something very like the total abolition of tithes; but they could count but a very few votes in a full House, and ministers carried another bill to amend the tithe system in Ireland. The state of that country rendered it absolutely necessary that the Coercion Bill, which was to expire in August, should be renewed for another year. The Lord Lieutenant, the Marquess Wellesley, vacillated in his opinions, and then recommended that the severity of the bill should be in part mitigated. Mr. Littleton, now secretary for Ireland, held the same opinions, and had committed the fatal error of negotiating with Mr. O'Connell unknown to the head of the government; and Lord Durham, Mr. Spring Rice, Mr. Abercromby, and other members of the government objected to a renewal of some of the clauses. Worried by the O'Connellites, Mr. Littleton tendered his resignation, which was refused, Lord Althorpe stating that his colleagues could not dispense with his valuable services. This *stormy and complicated business ended in the resignation*

of Lord Althorpe; and this resignation speedily determined that of Earl Grey. No other resignations, however, followed. Lord Melbourne was put at the head of the government in lieu of Earl Grey, and kissed hands on the 16th of July. He was succeeded as home-secretary by Viscount Duncannon; and Sir John Cam Hobhouse now took the woods and forests, with a seat in the cabinet. Some time after this Lord Carlisle resigned, and the Earl of Mulgrave took the privy seal. The new premier was obliged to declare that he did not intend to proceed with the Coercion Bill now before parliament; but that another measure, omitting certain clauses, would be immediately introduced in the Commons. This announcement produced a vehement discussion, wherein the Dukes of Wellington and Buckingham, the Earl of Wicklow, and other peers, maintained that since the Revolution no instance had occurred of such weakness, inconsistency, and tergiversation. The new or modified Coercion Bill was rapidly carried through both Houses; but it did not pass the Lords without a strong protest, signed by the Duke of Cumberland, the Duke of Wellington, and twenty-one other peers. The modified bill was so framed as to have not the least effect upon agitation and agitators. The protesting peers held that this agitation was the real source of nearly all the violence and crime which disgraced Ireland; and those who would dream over a different view of the case must first shut their eyes to facts. Uncontrolled and undeterred the Irish agitators plied their trade—a profitable trade for some of them—with even more than their former boldness.

The ministerial Tithes Bill for Ireland was now taken up in earnest. Lord Melbourne, in moving its second reading in the Upper House, plainly intimated that if it was lost government would propose no other grant for the relief of the Irish Protestant clergy. Although he admitted that there might be reasons for viewing with jealousy and distrust the quarter whence certain alterations made in the bill subsequently to its original introduction proceeded, yet he thought the arrangement itself

not a bad one for the clergy. The tithe in future was to be received by the crown and paid by the landlord, who, in return for the burden thus imposed on him, was to have a deduction of two-fifths, or forty per cent., of the original composition. The incomes of the clergy, however, were not to bear the whole deduction, which was only to be twenty-two and a half per cent. on them; that is, twenty per cent. for increased security, and two and a half per cent. for the expenses of collection: incumbents therefore would receive 77*l.* 10*s.* for every 100*l.*, without trouble, without the risk of bad debts, and without any of that odium which had hitherto attended the collection of tithes. Another consequence was, that the clergy would be relieved from the payment of sums already advanced to them from the treasury, as that charge would be laid on the landlord. The revision of existing compositions, made under the acts of 1823 and 1832, he thought also a proper enactment. The bill underwent a complete discussion: the Tory lords seeing no security for the rights and interests of the Irish clergy in yielding to what they considered an act of injustice; while their opponents thought that it would be much more advantageous to the clerical body to obtain the sum proposed without risk, than to recover a smaller, if they recovered any at all, through scenes of blood and slaughter. "But the bill," said Lord Brougham, "was to be rejected because Mr. O'Connell approved of it and had amended it: that was to say, a man whom they disliked had only to advise them how to save the country from a civil war, in order to insure the rejection of such a suggestion! It was very easy for such politicians to say, 'Am I to degrade myself by taking a leaf out of Mr. O'Connell's book? Shall I permit him to dictate to me?' But he did dictate to them; and the only difference was, that instead of taking the thing honestly and directly as a beneficial suggestion, they submitted to take the law from him, by enabling him to decide what they should not do." The Earl of Ripon and the Duke of Richmond wished the bill to go *into committee*, with an intention of restoring it to its

original state ; and, if unsuccessful in that, they would vote against the third reading. On a division, however, the second reading was rejected by a majority of sixty-seven ; and the Irish Protestant clergy were thus thrown on the charity of the British public, by whom a very large subscription was made to relieve their distresses.

Some of the dissenters of England would have fain left the clergy of the established church at home as hungry as their brethren in Ireland. They begged to be relieved from the necessity of supporting an establishment, in the advantages of which, they said, they did not participate. Many petitions were presented to parliament, praying to be relieved from church-rates ; and in many instances urging the separation of church and state, or recommending a general establishment of the voluntary system. They did not want advocates in parliament, for the radicals had long been looking at the great prize which might be gained in church property if the establishment should be overthrown. The petitions did not lead to any result, except that of producing a strong expression of opposite opinion, and calling forth numerous anti-petitions, praying parliament to preserve the church inviolate : ministers also fulfilled their declarations, that they would listen to no proposition for its destruction. Nevertheless, a motion made by Mr. Rippon, the new member for Gateshead, to expel the bishops from the House of Lords, found a minority of 58 voices in a House consisting of 183 members.

Among the grievances of which the dissenters complained in their numerous petitions, none were more strongly dwelt on than their practical exclusion from degrees at Oxford and Cambridge, in consequence of being required to sign a declaration of conformity with the Church of England, or to subscribe her articles. They demanded, as a matter of civil right, that religious tests should be abolished, and the universities thrown open for education, and a certain extent of graduation to men of any creed. It was clear that their chance of success would be greatly increased if they could state a feasible case of concurrent opinion in these learned bodies them-

selves: and fortune at this time favoured their exertions at Cambridge. Great pains had been lately taken by some of the medical professors in that university to advance the interests of their particular science: and, being alarmed at the exertions made in the metropolis, not only to establish a medical school, but to obtain the power of granting degrees, they felt anxious to ward off the mischief which might thence accrue to their Alma Mater, by opening her doors wider to students of medicine. For this purpose, however, it was necessary to admit others with them into the sanctuary; and, as a considerable body existed in the senate who thought the time had now arrived when dissenters from the established church might safely be admitted to such academical degrees as were unconnected with theology, and who, instead of seeing danger to the establishment from the introduction of a few young men of the higher class of dissenters into the academical body, thought rather that the dissenting community had reason to fear for the conversion of their youth,—a petition was got up without much difficulty, and signed by sixty-three resident members of the senate, praying for the abolition of religious tests offered to candidates for degrees in arts, law, and physic. At the same time, in making this request, the petitioners stated, “That they were only asking for a restitution of their ancient laws and laudable customs; since the restrictions complained of were imposed on the University in the reign of James I., most of them in a manner informal and unprecedented, and grievously against the wishes of many then members of the senate, in times of bitter party-animosities, and during the prevalence of dogmas both in church and state which are at variance with the present spirit of English law, and with the true principles of Christian toleration.”

This petition, which simply asked the removal of subscription—neither seeking the admission of dissenters as such, nor their participation in college fellowship, nor any change on their account in lectures or discipline—was presented on the 21st of March by Earl Grey in the *House of Lords*, and on the 24th by Mr. Spring Rice in

the Commons, being considered as a convenient instrument to try the temper of the two Houses, and ascertain the views of different parties by the discussion which it was sure to produce. No motion, however, was made till after the Easter recess; when Colonel Williams moved an address to his majesty, praying him to signify his royal pleasure to the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, that those bodies should act no longer under the edicts or letters of James I., 1616. It was however thought, for many reasons, more advisable to proceed by bill; and Mr. Wood, one of the members for Preston, moved an amendment to that effect, which was carried.*

Though the Cambridge petition had been presented in both Houses by members of the cabinet, and government had declared its entire concurrence in the prayer of the petitioners, no proposition on the subject was brought forward by ministers. Favourable as they were to the measure of relaxation, they expressed their hopes, that, as a portion of one of the universities was already inclined to it, the object, if not pressed too eagerly, might be effected with the concurrence of those learned bodies in a much better form, and to much better purpose, than if they were made to act reluctantly under the compulsion of a statute. They wished, therefore, that neither parliament nor government should be driven to interfere in the business before they could engage with a prospect of terminating it in the best and most satisfactory manner. The dissenters, however, and their partisans, took the matter into their own hands, and pressed on with such violence as soon disgusted their best friends. Ministers would not run the risk of preventing them, but took no lead in the measure, though they supported it by their speeches and votes.

Before the bill was brought in, the sentiments of the great mass in the two academical bodies became fully expressed. It was soon discovered that the sixty-three petitioners at Cambridge, by offending the honest principles of many, and the rancorous party-spirit of a few,

* Annual Register for 1834.

had raised a storm which no argument or explanation, though it engaged some of the ablest pens in that university, could allay. Meetings were held almost daily, pamphlets were showered forth like hail, the public journals gave up their pages to the contest, and the university pulpit resounded with the most awful denunciations. During the excitement thus provoked, a counter-petition was signed by 258 members, resident and non-resident, comprising eleven heads of houses, eight professors, and twenty-nine tutors; while a second was signed by 755 under-graduates and bachelors of arts. These were presented, on the 21st of April, by the Duke of Gloucester, as Chancellor of the University, in the House of Lords; and by Mr. Goulburn, one of its representatives, in the House of Commons. On the 9th of May, Mr. Estcourt presented a similar document from the University of Oxford; and a second petition was sent from Cambridge, signed by many members of the senate who had not signed the other.

Although Mr. Wood brought in his bill soon after the Easter holidays, it was not till the 20th of June that he was enabled to move the second reading. Mr. Estcourt then proposed, as an amendment, that it should be read a second time that day six months: he argued that the course of education pursued at Oxford and Cambridge was essentially a religious one, and the supporters of the bill could not succeed in their object without destroying the religious part of the system. "This indeed," he said, "was the aim of the dissenters; to introduce a system of education which would lead to a dissolution of the connexion existing between the church and state; or, in other words, to the destruction of the established religion of the country." Mr. Herbert, who seconded the amendment, enforced the argument:—"It had been suggested," he said, "that persons of all denominations might be taught the leading doctrines of morality and religion without touching on debateable questions; but he doubted if this were possible; and he expected no advantage from so vague a system of theology—an emasculated kind of instruction in Christianity and morals, producing no

feeling of confidence or reverence in the minds of its pupils : a bill like the present would operate as a direct exclusion of the clergy from the universities, and every parish in England would feel the consequences !” In addition to this argument, the honourable gentleman asked why the dissenters, who were an opulent and intelligent body, did not found colleges of their own, in which they might adopt that system which pleased them best ; and if they hedged in their institutions with religious tests calculated to exclude churchmen, the latter would not complain. The answer to this was given in the speech of Mr. Potter, who, with Messrs. Ewart and Poulter, spoke in favour of the bill ; contending that the alteration required was necessary, no less for the benefit of the universities than in justice to the dissenters : by the present system the latter were impeded in their progress to the bar by having to keep terms for five years instead of three, and were prevented from becoming fellows of the college of physicians for want of academical degrees ; and this could not be remedied by degrees of their own. With regard to subscription of the thirty-nine articles, it was said, that instead of insuring sincerity in religion, it generated hypocrisy and indifference to religion altogether ; it was also declared that the exclusive spirit of the universities, being no longer in accordance with the spirit of the age, could not much longer be preserved ; especially when so large a body of dissenters had grown up, actuated by a desire of obtaining their just rights. Mr. C. W. Wynne was convinced that the present bill was but the first of a series of measures, which, if not checked in time, must lead to the subversion of the established church and the destruction of all our institutions. On the other hand, Mr. Spring Rice complained that it was unfair to treat the bill not according to its own deserts, but in reference to other supposed measures which might or might not be connected with that under discussion : in the course of his argument, he asked what could be more inconsistent and unjust than the practice now prevailing at Cambridge, where dissenters were admitted so far as in-

struction was concerned, but excluded from everything to which instruction ought to lead? They were admitted to the fullest and most complete course of study until the twelfth term; when, on being brought into fair competition with their fellow-students, the odious principle of exclusion intervened, and the dissenter was told, that however obedient he had been to college regulations, however high the eminence he had acquired, still he should not be allowed the badge or symbol of his acquirements, simply because he was a dissenter. He really thought that, so far from deteriorating or endangering the church establishment, the approximation of dissenters to its members in a course of education might bring many within the pale of that church who would otherwise continue to dissent from it; and he denied that the mixture of persons differing in religious persuasions at Cambridge had been injurious either to the university or any other institution of the country. The House had the benefit of experience, for in Dublin dissenters were admitted to degrees, though excluded from fellowships and all participation in the internal management of the university: and what mischief had followed the admission? Was the university less orthodox in its principles, or less a Protestant foundation than before? Had the zeal of its public instructors been lessened, or their sphere of usefulness narrowed by this interference? It had been said that the dissenters ought to found universities of their own: he concurred in that argument; but the English universities would not allow them to do so; when they proposed such a step, in order to educate the youth of their own persuasion, and reward them with those honours which the universities denied, and thus sought to secure to themselves academical honours and privileges, the universities stepped forward and said,—We will not only exclude you from our seats, but will also prevent your enjoying the advantages and privileges of a university of your own. This double ground of exclusion and prohibition was what no one could defend.

The colonial secretary was answered by Mr. Goulburn,

who argued that in proportion as the advocates of the bill enforced the danger of excluding dissenters, they rendered manifest the ruinous consequences of concession ; if the dissenters deemed it so hard to be deprived of the empty honour of a degree, what would they say if they were admitted to degrees and found a bar raised against their admission to college emoluments and distinctions ? When it was said by the right honourable gentleman that Dublin afforded an example which they might safely follow, it was an unhappy one in itself, and unfairly stated ; in Dublin the degree conferred on its possessor no power of government, and on this point all the merits of the intended comparison turned : besides, an Irish member had a motion now on the order-book requiring that dissenters should be placed on the same footing with members of the establishment, in respect to scholarships and fellowships in that university ; and his plea was, that, as we were about to admit dissenters to degrees in England, he saw no reason why dissenters in Ireland should not have the advantages which those degrees conferred in England. In speaking of the course pursued at Cambridge, the broad distinction had been forgotten, that a dissenter was not admitted as such, but as a member of the university willing to submit to its regulations ; and, till the period for taking his degree arrived, he followed the rules prescribed by that body ; but if he were brought to college openly as a dissenter, either he was absolved from the restraints of religious discipline, or was forced to proclaim his own hypocrisy. Under the proposed bill, every class of dissenters, Jews, Turks, Infidels, Socinians, men of any denomination, would be admissible to degrees ; it repealed *ipso facto* all the statutes which regulated the internal government of colleges, and did away with all that religious attendance which had been justly lauded : now religious instruction should never be disjoined from general education ; and there had been a time in our history when opposite sentiments would have drawn down universal reprobation. The right honourable gentleman went on to show the evil consequences of a system of education without a religious test, drawn

from foreign universities; and implored the House to abstain from depriving Christianity of the advantages which it derived from the discipline and constitution of our own—from dissevering religion and learning.

Mr. Stanley said, that when the first Cambridge petition was presented, he had been disposed to concur in its prayer, so far as might be consistent with the safety of the established church; but he would not conceal his feeling, that the tone subsequently assumed, and the principles asserted by the dissenters, had tended to change in some respects his opinion, and rendered it necessary for the House to view their whole claims with more jealousy than before: still he would vote for the principle of the bill, but not as declaring for a change in the system of university education. It was only in Oxford that subscription to the thirty-nine articles was required from a student entering the university; though a member of that university, he wished to see this part of the system altered, for he could not bring himself to believe in that gloss which had been put on it,—that such subscription was merely a matter of form, and that no real adhesion to those articles was implied until the party was instructed in their meaning.

Sir Robert Peel, after a long speech, in which he characterised the bill as an enactment intended to give to Jews, infidels, and atheists,—to the man who professed some religion, and to the man who professed none,—a statutable right to demand admission into our universities; declared that, after a removal of all civil disabilities from dissenters by the repeal of the Corporation and Test Acts, and from Roman Catholics by the Act of Emancipation; and after a vast change effected by the Reform Bill in the constitution of Parliament, the question at last was, Were we, or were we not, to maintain an established religion? In all those measures of relief alluded to, there never was an intimation that they would lead to farther demands, and lay a foundation for ulterior claims. To concede the demands now made, he asserted, would not be for the advantage of the dissenters themselves; to whom, as well as to all Christians, the preservation of the

established church was an inestimable benefit, to protect them as well from superstition on the one hand, as fanaticism on the other; and secure to them and their posterity the decent observance of divine worship, and the substantial benefits of toleration; which could be secured only by such an establishment. What, he asked, constituted the union between church and state? What was the essence of an established church? What, but a legislative recognition of it on the part of the state? Parliament, therefore, was entitled to say to the dissenters,—“With that legislative recognition you shall not interfere.”

Sir R. H. Inglis and Lord Sandon also opposed the bill, which was supported by Lord Althorpe, who strenuously contended, that by such support he would be guilty of no hostile act against the established church: he maintained that interference with Divine worship was no necessary consequence of the bill, neither would it interfere with the education of members of the church of England; for if it passed into a law, it would only entitle dissenters to take a degree without subscription to any articles of religion, or any declaration of faith; neither investing them with fellowships, nor with the power of instructing youth; for the principle of the bill therefore he was prepared to vote; and in committee, all changes might be effected for limiting that principle to the extent required. The House then divided, and the second reading was carried by 321 votes against 174. In the committee, the Speaker gave his decided opposition to the principle of the bill, and some amendments having been made, it was read a third time, and passed, on the 28th of July, by a majority of 164 against 75. The Earl of Radnor took charge of the bill in the House of Lords, where the arguments for and against it did not vary from those used in the Commons. The Duke of Gloucester, Chancellor of the University of Cambridge, after denouncing the bill not only as uncalled for, but most unjust and mischievous, moved, as an amendment, that it be read that day six months. His royal highness was followed by the Duke of Wellington, Chancellor of Oxford, who argued forcibly on the same side. Lord-Chancellor

Brougham supported the bill, because he thought it went to remove a practical grievance, without affecting the discipline of the universities or the safety of the church ; and the discussion was closed by a long and ingenious speech from the Bishop of Exeter ; when a division took place, and the amendment was carried by the overwhelming majority of 187 against 85 who voted for the second reading.

The dissenters generally, who had materially aided the Whig ministers at the last general election, put a very high price on their services, and seemed to consider that they could not ask too much from ministerial gratitude. They demanded to be released from the payment of church-rates. Mr. Divett made a motion in the House of Commons to that effect. Some of the friends of dissent, in supporting the motion, said that if practical grievances were not removed, the established church would possess little security, as the dissenters had become so formidable in numbers. In this estimate noise was made to pass for numbers. Lord Althorpe said that, as he had himself given notice of a motion on this subject, and as he did not think the present a desirable occasion to adopt the principle contained in the resolution, he should move the previous question. Mr. Divett was willing to wait for the government plan, and withdrew his motion. On the 21st of April, Lord Althorpe brought forward that plan in the shape of a resolution, " That, after a fixed time, church-rates should cease ; and in lieu thereof, a sum not exceeding 250,000*l.* should be granted from the land-tax, to be applied as parliament should direct." His intention, he said, was to provide for the fabrics of the church, and to relieve the dissenters at the same time. 'This scheme, however, did not at all suit the views of the dissenters. Mr. Hume led the attack against it, calling it a contemptible juggle, founded on the old financial principle, that if money were taken out of the pockets of the people by indirect means, they would not be sensible of their loss. On a division, the motion was indeed carried by 256 against 140. But government found it expedient to proceed no farther with the measure.

Ministers were not more fortunate in another attempt to gratify the dissenters, by allowing them to celebrate the marriage ceremony in their own chapels. A bill to this effect, brought in by Lord John Russell, was refused by them, principally on the ground that it required the banns to be published in the parish church, which, they said, involved a principle that rendered them inferior to their fellow subjects.

Lord Althorpe moved a resolution touching the commutation of tithes in England. He set out with two propositions,—“First, that whatever difference of opinion might exist as to the abstract right of tithes, they did not belong to the landlord; secondly, that the revenues of the established church were not larger than its purposes required: tithes, therefore, must be treated as property belonging to the church, and consequently they could not be taken away without a fair equivalent.” What his lordship would have altered, was the mode of collecting the tithes. This, he said, was a source of irritation, and not unfrequently of unpleasant collision. It might be avoided by commutation. But the principles and details of the method he proposed were relished neither by the clergy nor by the landholders; and the measure was dropped for the present.

One of the very few important measures carried through in this session was a bill for altering and amending the Poor-laws. This was, indeed, a measure of vital importance. The bill may not have been perfect in all its parts—it may have had some un-English harshness and severity—and its bad qualities may have been made worse by peremptory and unfeeling commissioners; but to have long left those Poor-laws as they were, would have been, if not impossible, excessively dangerous to the whole fabric of society.

Shortly after their accession to office, ministers had appointed a commission to inquire into the state and operation of the old laws. Mr. Edwin Chadwick gave proof of great industry and ability in conducting this inquiry; if we are not misinformed, he did well-nigh the whole work of the commission, and *his* was the report

that was presented to ministers, and printed and distributed among the members of both houses. This report, and the evidence upon which it was founded, confirmed government in the conviction that the whole system must be altered ; and, on the 17th of April, Lord Althorpe moved for leave to bring in a bill to alter and amend the laws relating to the poor.

It was demonstrated that those old laws, as now administered, tended directly to the destruction of all property in the country, and that they must eventually be fatal even to the labouring classes for whose benefit they were intended. It was the abuse of the old system rather than the system itself that was to blame. This abuse was scarcely older than the beginning of the present century. At that period, when the French revolution and the spread of Jacobinical principles alarmed all established governments, a belief had got abroad that great discontent existed among our labouring classes, and that this feeling must be removed by indulgence and concessions. The 36th Geo. III. laid down the principle that the relief to paupers ought to be given in such a manner as to place them in a situation of comfort. The effect of this act had been to give the magistrates, overseers, &c., the power of ordering relief to be given to the poor in their own dwellings, or on the road side. The principle, being followed out, had led from bad to worse, until all feelings of independence and self-respect on the part of the labourers seemed to be nearly extinguished in many parts of the country ; and instead of the paupers being placed in a state of comfort, all the labouring population, in many districts of the country, had been brought into a state of deplorable misery and demoralization.

To undo this fearful state of things, boldness was required on the part of government. Examples, however, were not wanting. In about 100 of our rural parishes the evils of the existing system had compelled the respectable inhabitants to have recourse to an improved mode of administration. In other parishes, where this improvement had not been introduced, the cultivation of

the soil had, to a great extent, been actually abandoned ; so heavy, so crushing was the weight of the poor-rates, so overwhelming the evils which had followed upon the heels of a faulty principle and an absurd mismanagement ! The consequence was that the parishes neighbouring on these untilled parishes were obliged to support *their* poor : these neighbouring parishes, doubly or trebly burthened, must soon be reduced to the same dead level of want and woe ; and thus pauperism would stride throughout the land !

The first part of the ministerial plan consisted in intrusting the entire management of the poor and the poor-laws to a board of commissioners named and appointed by ministers. Lord Althorpe admitted that this was an unusual and extreme mode of legislation, and that the Poor-law commissioners must have very great and extensive powers ; but he held that this was an inevitable necessity. A full discretionary power must be vested somewhere to carry into effect the new principles and the thorough change now proposed. The local magistrates could not be the fittest depositaries of this power, because, however good their intentions, they would not have the command of those sources of information and comparison which were open to a board of commissioners, and, however excellent their motives, they would be apt to be biassed by local prejudices and local sympathies. But, before fixing this discretionary power—before doing anything else—an end must be put to the allowance system ! This system, or the practice of supporting a labourer by the parish paying one part of his wages and the farmer who employed him the other part, was the foundation of nearly all the evils which cried out for amendment. Until the country was entirely rid of this practice, it would be utterly useless to attempt amending the Poor-laws. Let this abomination cease, and the labourer would be placed in a situation incomparably, infinitely better than that which he at present occupied. Wages would rise, and he would receive those wages without stigma or degradation. Now he was only half a free paid labourer and half a pauper.

We cannot, in an abridgement or mere *précis* of history like this, give either the debates upon the bill, or the details of the bill itself. The opposition to it was, from the first, very violent, and was headed by Mr. Walter, member for Berkshire, and proprietor of the 'Times' newspaper. Some modifications were made in the Commons and some amendments in the Lords; and the Act 4 & 5 William IV. was passed in August.

On the 6th of March Mr. Hume had opened a discussion, by moving—"That this House do resolve itself into a Committee of the whole House, to consider of the corn laws, and of substituting, instead of the present graduated scale of duties, a fixed and moderate duty on the import, at all times, of foreign corn into the United Kingdom, with the ultimate view of establishing a free trade in corn." This motion was premature, and, when the discussion had lasted two days, it was rejected by fully two to one, the numbers dividing being 312 against 155. Mr. Poulett Thomson, though a member of the government, voted for Mr. Hume, or for free trade. Both Lord Morpeth and Lord Howick took the same course, contending that it was the corn laws which kept the agricultural interest in a state of depression, when all other interests were prospering; that protection had injured, was now injuring, and would for ever continue to injure, the protected. The Irish members did not exhibit themselves as advocates of free trade: all those who spoke were decidedly adverse to the proposition, and hoped that all their colleagues in the representation of Ireland would be equally so; for they maintained that a repeal of the corn laws would deprive Ireland of the market for three-fourths of her produce, and render her incapable of consuming the manufactures of England.

Some further slight reductions were made in taxation, but it was again somewhat to the injury of the strength and efficiency of the great national defences. Mr. Hume, who would have been casting up totals or clamouring for little savings if the French navy had been riding triumphant in the Channel ready to cast on shore an invading army of 100,000 men, would have

still farther reduced our navy estimates, if he had been able.

On the 15th of August his majesty prorogued parliament. The speech dwelt with satisfaction on the numerous and important questions which had engaged their attention, alluding more particularly to the new Poor-laws, and the establishment of a central court for the trial of offences in the metropolis and its vicinity. It lamented the still unsettled state of Holland and Belgium, but expressed a lively satisfaction at the termination of the civil war in Portugal. It mentioned the Quadripartite Treaty which had been formed by his Britannic Majesty, the King of the French, the Queen Regent of Spain, and Dom Pedro the Regent of Portugal; affirming that the said treaty had already contributed to produce a happy result.

By this time the Whig ministry was falling to pieces: it had rapidly lost much of its popularity. The Radicals and Irish agitators had converted themselves into bitter and very active enemies, and the retirement of Earl Grey had greatly weakened the cabinet. The 'Times' newspaper, which was exercising a greater influence over popular opinion than any mere journal ought to possess, had singled out the chancellor, Lord Brougham, for its bitter and incessant attacks. His lordship also had disagreed with several of his colleagues. The crisis was precipitated by the death of Earl Spencer on the 10th of November. This called up Lord Althorpe to the House of Peers, making it necessary to find a new chancellor of the exchequer, and a new leader of the House of Commons. On Friday, the 14th of November, when Lord Melbourne waited on the king for the purpose of submitting to him some necessary changes in official appointments, his majesty informed him that he need not be at the trouble of completing his arrangements, as he intended to apply to the Duke of Wellington. On the following day the duke advised his majesty to intrust the government to Sir Robert Peel. This was what the king was prepared to do. Sir Robert, little expecting to be so suddenly made premier, had gone on a journey into Italy,

and was now at Rome. The Duke of Wellington undertook to carry on the public business till his return, and was temporarily appointed first lord of the treasury, and sworn in as one of the principal secretaries of state. The Radicals and some of the more violent or most disappointed Whigs accused his grace of unconstitutional conduct in monopolizing in his single person all the powers of the state. The displaced attorney-general for England (Sir John, now my Lord, Campbell), at a public meeting in Edinburgh, menaced his grace with impeachment. The duke laughed and did his work, and the illustrious son of the Lancashire cotton-spinner made the best haste he could to get back to England.

By the end of December the official arrangements were completed—Lord Lyndhurst was chancellor, the Earl of Rosslyn became president of the council, Lord Wharncliffe privy seal, the Duke of Wellington secretary for foreign affairs, Mr. Goulburn for the home department, and Lord Aberdeen for the colonies; Mr. A. Baring was made president of the board of trade, Sir G. Murray master-general of the ordnance, Sir E. Knatchbull paymaster of the forces, Earl de Grey first lord of the admiralty, and Lord Ellenborough president of the board of control; Lord Maryborough, the Earls of Jersey and Roden, Mr. C. Wynne, and Mr. Herries came also into office; Mr. F. Pollock and Mr. Follett were made attorney and solicitor general; the Earl of Harrington went as viceroy to Ireland, with Sir E. Sugden as the lord chancellor and Sir H. Hardinge as chief secretary. Sir James Scarlett now received the reward of his adhesion to a Tory administration, being appointed to succeed Lord Lyndhurst as chief baron of the exchequer, with the title of Lord Abinger.

On the 30th of December a proclamation was issued, dissolving the parliament and convoking a new one to meet on the 19th of February.

It was not the Pedroites by themselves who had put down the Miguelites. If the two factions had been left alone, the civil war might have lasted for many years. Early in the year Leira was taken for Dom Pedro by

Marshal Saldanha; and in April a Spanish army, under General Rodil, entered Portugal for the alleged purpose of seizing Don Carlos, the pretender to the Spanish crown, who, with a few followers, had crossed over the frontier and taken refuge with Dom Miguel. On the approach of the Spanish troops the important town of Almeida set up a shout for the constitution, and declared for the young queen. Shortly after this the Quadripartite Treaty was signed at Lisbon. It had for its object the pacification of Spain and Portugal, by the expulsion of Don Carlos and Dom Miguel from the Portuguese territory. On the 26th of May, after the surrender of Santarem, Dom Miguel was obliged to capitulate and sign the convention of Evora. He was permitted to leave Portugal and to embark for Italy. This event ended the struggle, and the young queen was firmly seated on the throne, the regency being continued in her father. Dom Pedro suppressed the monastic establishments and seized their property. This was no more than what the monks had always expected from the establishment of the constitution; and it was to avoid the doom that they had fought for Dom Miguel and armed the people in his cause. The property was badly sold, and the money soon wasted. The regent attempted to call in the discredited paper-money, and to establish a metallic currency; but he was not very successful, and ever since his time the finances of the country have been in a lamentable state.

In Spain the civil war, which had its principal seat in the Biscayan provinces, continued to rage, and with even more fury than commonly attends such internecine contests. The Biscayans had merely made of Don Carlos what the priests and monks had made of Dom Miguel. They had set him up as a rallying point, and as a defender of their ancient rights and privileges. For the pretender, personally, they cared very little. They would have quietly submitted to the young queen, if the constitutionalists had been content to leave them in the possession of their own ancient and solemnly-guaranteed privileges. The Biscayans, who had been for many centuries a very

free people, and whose privileges and immunities were well worth fighting for, said no, and proclaimed Don Carlos. An incredible amount of ignorance and nonsense was displayed in England on this subject by rhetoricians and journalists. It was said to be the duty of England to support the cause of liberty wherever it was in jeopardy; it was said that the Englishmen who went over to fight for Queen Isabella and the constitution were engaged in a holy warfare: yet, in those Biscayan provinces, the war was a war against liberty—a conflict into which no Englishman ought ever to have entered. The insurrection had spread to Catalonia and other provinces. On the 24th of July, Christina, the queen regent, opened the session of the Cortes. They easily voted a bill for excluding Don Carlos from the throne; but they could not so easily drive him out of Spain; for, after a short visit to England, he had thrown himself among the bold mountains and brave men of Biscay, and he possessed in Zumalacarregui a general of extraordinary abilities and resources. The queen regent found, to her very great perplexity, that her soldiery were very mutinous, that the people would not pay taxes, and that no ministry she could form was capable of standing much more than three months. Mina, who had gained celebrity as a guerrilla chief in the time of Bonaparte's intrusion, was sent against Zumalacarregui, to be beaten, and foiled, and out-manceuvred.

A.D. 1835.—In taking office Sir Robert Peel had taken the resolution not to interfere with the Reform Bill. In his well-known address to his constituents at Tamworth he said:—"With respect to the Reform Bill, I will repeat now the declaration which I made when I entered the House of Commons as a member of the reformed parliament;—that I consider that act as a final and irrevocable settlement—a settlement which no friend to the peace and welfare of his country would attempt to disturb, either by direct or indirect means." After deprecating such a use of the Reform Bill, or any such extension of it as would lead to a perpetual vortex of *agitation*, and the overthrow of ancient rights and insti-

tutions, Sir Robert further said :—" If the spirit of the bill implies merely a careful review of institutions, civil and ecclesiastical, undertaken in a friendly temper ; combining, with the firm maintenance of established rights, the correction of proved abuses, and the redress of real grievances ;—in that case I can, for myself and my colleagues, undertake to act in such a spirit and with such intentions."

Before the meeting of parliament there appeared in the London Gazette of the 3rd of February an announcement that the king had issued letters patent, appointing the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Lord High Chancellor, the Archbishop of York, the Earl of Harrowby, the Bishops of London, Lincoln, and Gloucester, the Right Honourable Sir Robert Peel, H. Goulburn, C. W. W. Wynne, H. Hobhouse, and Sir Herbert Jenner, to be commissioners for considering the state of the several dioceses in England and Wales, with reference to the amount of their revenues, to the more equal distribution of episcopal duties, and to the prevention of the necessity of attaching by commendam to bishoprics benefices with the cure of souls ; for considering the state of the several cathedral and collegiate churches within the same, with a view to the suggestion of measures for rendering them most conducive to the efficacy of the established church ; also for devising the best mode of providing for the cure of souls, with special reference to the residence of the clergy on their respective benefices.

Immense exertions had been made at and previously to the general election by Conservatives, Whigs, and Radicals. The Conservatives were rather successful in the counties, and rather unsuccessful in the boroughs. If the Radicals should stand by the Whigs, it was pretty clear that the Peel administration must soon fall.

On the appointed day, the 19th of February, the new parliament assembled in full force. A trial of strength presently took place. Lord Francis Egerton moved the re-appointment of Sir Charles Manners Sutton ; Mr. W. J. Dennison moved that Mr. Abercromby should be

Speaker. Sir Robert Peel and Lord Stanley supported Lord Francis; Lord John Russell supported Mr. Denison. When the House divided, there appeared for Sir Charles M. Sutton 306, and for Mr. Abercromby 316 votes; Mr. Abercromby was then conducted to the chair, which neither before nor since has had a worthier occupant. There are other duties attached to the office of Speaker than those which pass before the eyes of the public in the House of Commons. These duties had been but indifferently performed, and in most cases they had been left to clerks and secretaries. Mr. Abercromby did everything himself; he attended most scrupulously to every official duty; and he was never known to keep a parliamentary agent or a deputation waiting. Hence the speed and facility with which the public business was transacted, and an immense and ever-increasing number of private bills got passed.

Three days having been spent in administering the oaths, the king, on the 24th, went in state to the House of Peers to open the new parliament. The two Houses having been burned down in the preceding month of November, temporary rooms had been fitted up for the accommodation of the peers and the commons. After alluding to the flourishing state of trade and commerce, as well as of the public revenue, his majesty lamented the depressed state of agriculture, and earnestly recommended the consideration of it to parliament, with a view to relief. Having adverted to various projected measures of domestic policy, such as the Irish tithe question, the commutation of tithe in England and Wales, the improvement of civil jurisprudence and administration of justice in ecclesiastical causes, provision for the more effectual maintenance of ecclesiastical discipline, relief of dissenters from the marriage ceremony, and the corporation and church commissions; his majesty expressed his confidence in the willing co-operation of parliament, as well as in their caution and circumspection, regarding the alteration of laws which affected very extensive and complicated interests, interwoven with ancient usages, and *conformable to the habits and feelings of his people.*

The address in the Lords was carried without a division, though not without a debate. The debate turned chiefly on the late change of administration. Lord Melbourne severely censured the late dissolution of parliament, and attacked the Duke of Wellington for having held at one and the same time the office of the first lord of the treasury and the seals of the three great departments of the state. He admitted that his grace had assumed these offices only for a temporary purpose, and that his doing so might be defended on the ground of necessity and urgency of the case; but it lay with the Duke of Wellington to justify that necessity. The duke calmly replied, when the king empowered him to form a ministry, he had declined the offer, however flattering it might have been to ambition; he did not act as one who had a personal object to serve; he refused the office of prime minister, and recommended to his majesty to send for Sir Robert Peel as the individual most capable, in the present times, of discharging the duties of king's first minister. It was necessary, both that some person should be in the government till Sir Robert's return, and that whoever carried it on should exercise no patronage, nor take any step which might prevent the new minister, on his arrival, from acting with perfect freedom. He had therefore advised his majesty to place him (the duke) provisionally at the head of affairs as first lord of the treasury and secretary of the home department. It was true that in the latter capacity he held the seals of the three secretaryships: but whoever was appointed to any one of these three offices was competent to hold the seals of the other two in the absence of those to whom they had been confided; and he had exercised no more authority than if he had been one of the three principal secretaries, and his colleagues absent. No inconvenience had resulted from the arrangement. During the time he held the seals there was not a single office disposed of, or act done which was not essentially necessary for the service of the king and of the country; and Sir Robert Peel found all things as nearly as might be in the same situation in which they had been when the change of

ministry took place. It might be true that there was an incompatibility between the secretaryships and the office of first lord of the treasury, if these offices were held by the same individual for any length of time; but every body knew that the arrangement was merely temporary. He had only held the government provisionally for another individual who had been sent for by his sovereign. Mr. Canning had been named first lord of the treasury on the 12th of April, while he was yet foreign secretary, and he did not resign the latter office till the 30th of April.

His grace repelled likewise the charge which had been made of his being in any degree responsible for the dissolution of the late government. All the idle stories which had been propagated about court intrigues were now laid aside (Lord Melbourne here remarked that he had never propagated them); it was now fully admitted on all hands that no such thing had existed. For his own part he had had no communication of any description with the court for between two and three months before he received his majesty's message; and, although he was satisfied that some great change in the administration must follow the removal of Lord Althorpe from the House of Commons, that message was as much a matter of surprise to him as it possibly could be to any of their lordships. The late administration had been dissolved by the impossibility of going on longer, from the time they lost their leader in the House of Commons. When Lord Althorpe had resigned on a former occasion, Earl Grey had stated that he could not, under such circumstances, continue at the head of the government, for, by the resignation of Lord Althorpe, he had lost his right hand, and it would be impossible to carry on the government with advantage from the time that that noble lord had quitted power. But that was not all. Viscount Melbourne himself had stated to their lordships, as one of the grounds on which he had been induced to take office, that he had been assured that Lord Althorpe was willing to go on in office with him, and therefore that, *with his assistance*, he would consent to undertake to

carry on the government. But even that was not all ; for when Lord Melbourne found that he was likely to lose the aid of Lord Althorpe, he declared that he should himself be placed in great difficulty, because the noble lord was the very foundation on which the government stood, and when that was removed, it was impossible to go on. When, then, the question of the government came before his majesty, it was fairly put to him, whether he would seek for other counsels, and whether he would consent to other arrangements for the formation of a government, or whether he would be content to abide by that particular administration which at that moment existed. Let their lordships only observe the situation in which the king was placed, and ask themselves what he was to think of the new position in which he found himself. Earl Grey had been under the necessity of resigning, when Lord Althorpe, then chancellor of the exchequer, resigned. The noble viscount, too, had declared that he considered the noble lord's assistance essentially necessary to him. But when his majesty was left by Earl Grey, and when Lord Althorpe was removed from the other House, his majesty, forsooth, was not to be permitted to consider whether his position was not materially altered by these events, and whether it would not be expedient for him to make some other arrangements for the carrying on of his service. Everybody, indeed, but his majesty was to be allowed to consider the alterations which had taken place by the loss of Lord Althorpe in the House of Commons. Their lordships, however, he was convinced, would not acquiesce in this exclusion. Lastly, as to the dissolution of parliament ; it was true that a ministry, who advised the dissolution of a parliament, was liable to be called on for some reason which might have induced them so to do ; but he had seldom heard of such a course of proceeding as that ministers should be told, on the first day of the assembling of parliament, " Give me some reason why you thought fit to dissolve, and justify your dissolution of parliament, by showing that the effort you have made has been a successful one." The noble viscount (Melbourne), after

heaping his censure upon them for dissolving, added, that in all cases where parliament was dissolved, it was success which justified the measure. If, then, they had made an experiment which was to depend upon so peremptory a criterion, surely he ought, at least, to allow them a short time to wait and see fairly what had been the result. It would be but fair to give them some little time for the prescribed justification, and not to assail them on the first day of the session. And now as to this success, he wanted to know, after all, how great was the measure of success which the late ministry enjoyed in the late parliament, when it appeared to rest solely and exclusively on the shoulders of a single individual, from which too, there was no mantle to fall for a successor? So that, when he was removed to the Upper House, the government to which he belonged had found it impossible to go on. As to himself, he was convinced that the course which had been pursued was correct, and by it he was ready to stand or fall. He believed there were a great number of persons determined to support the administration, and he hoped the House would have the patience to wait and see what were the measures they had to propose for the benefit of the country.

Lord Brougham, on the other hand, maintained that the Duke of Wellington was responsible for the dismissal of the late ministry, not as having advised or produced it, which he certainly had not done, but as having succeeded to it; for whoever, he argued, takes the place of a dismissed ministry becomes answerable for that dismissal. For many acts of a government a minister might be held responsible, and would by law be held responsible, although ignorant of those acts, and albeit he did not advise them. The reason was simply this—the king could do no wrong; he must, however, have some adviser, and therefore some responsible adviser. Now, the noble duke stood in this position; he was peculiarly, he was emphatically, responsible for the change of his majesty's advisers. For who could be responsible but he who came into the space which the change had made vacant? If the king thought proper to take the seals

from one man to give them to another, the man who took the seals became responsible for the change; he was responsible in point of fact as well as in law; but for his assistance the act could not have been committed.

If a person indeed had resigned, and would not come back, that would be another matter; but if a man were dismissed against his will, whoever took that man's place after the dismissal was an accessory after the fact, because without his aid it could not have been completed. If a man were sent for by the sovereign under such circumstances, there was no compulsion upon him to accept the office—what had he to do but to decline? No harm would be then done. It was only an inchoate act until the place was actually filled up. The constitution was so cognizant of this, that no office was absolutely considered to be vacant until it was filled up. This was clearly proved in Mr. Pelham's case; several persons had declined his office; he had already resigned the seals; but upon his receiving them back again it was decided by the House that he need not go to a new election; that he had not vacated his seat; that it had never been effectually vacated, and never could be until his office was filled up. His lordship then argued that nothing like a tangible or intelligible reason for the change of ministry had been ever hinted at. The king's speech, he maintained, admitted that the late ministers had not been dismissed on account of any misconduct of their own. According to that speech peace had been maintained abroad and prosperity at home: the scheme for the emancipation of the negroes had been successful. The commission for inquiring into municipal corporations, instead of being denounced as illegal, was to be allowed to proceed, and its results were to be submitted to the legislature. The revenue was flourishing, trade was most prosperous, an eulogium was delivered upon the happy state of our commercial concerns, and the clearest evidences were afforded of the general prosperity of the country without a particle of blame being attached to—without the least imaginable imputation being cast on—the policy of the late administration. It

was not for a single moment pretended that the dismissal of the late administration arose from any incapacity on their part; it was not from any want of success in their measures; it was not from any failure of any sort or description that, on the 14th of last November, the late administration was dissolved. But, forsooth, it was dissolved because Lord Althorpe had been called from the House of Commons to the House of Lords, and without him, it was said, the government could not go on. The late ministers, it seemed, had not an estate for the life of the king nor for the life of the parliament; they did not hold their places during good behaviour, nor during pleasure, nor as long as they were efficient, nor upon condition of their measures being attended with success; they held them simply during the natural life of the late Lord Spencer, and no longer, that noble lord being seventy-eight years of age. The position contended for on the other side was this: that the moment Lord Spencer ceased to exist, that moment the administration must cease to exist likewise. Upon whose authority did that statement rest? Upon the authority of Earl Grey. Now, if the authority of Earl Grey were good for anything, it was equally good throughout; he could not be wise on one question only, and of no value upon all others; and Earl Grey had said openly of the Tories, "the Tories are ashamed of their name, and have sheltered themselves under the title of 'Conservatives.' 'Those persons fancy they can take the government. Let them only try it.'" The idea was absolutely hopeless; it was ridiculously impossible. As to the value of Lord Althorpe in the House of Commons, it was not overrated by Lord Grey; at the same time, the death of Lord Spencer, though most unfortunate, was not unexpected. The advisers of the crown at that time looked forward repeatedly to that event, and canvassed it in every point of view. As men of prudence, of ordinary prudence, they must have most deeply felt the loss—not, as the noble duke seemed to think, the total loss of Lord Althorpe to the administration, but his removal from one House to the other. The total loss of Lord Althorpe to

the cabinet was not contemplated ; but even for that event they were fully prepared ; on that point they had not the slightest hesitation ; it was a subject upon which they entertained not a particle of doubt ; those who represented them as having any difference of opinion with reference to it made a most false representation, and still more false was the representation of those who had dared to represent, in the face of known facts, that his noble friend near him had ever expressed to his majesty a shadow of doubt as to the practicability of going on with the government, even though it should sustain such a loss as that of Lord Althorpe. There never had been an admission on the part of the late ministers that they were not prepared to carry on the government.

As to the question which had been put, whether the king was to be the only person excluded from forming an opinion as to the propriety of changing the ministry, Lord Brougham argued that, though the power of nomination was vested primarily in the king, it was not a thing to be used capriciously or unreasonably.

Passing to the dissolution of parliament, his lordship said that the reason given for that proceeding, and the assertion which was made the pretext for dismissing the ministry, were contradictory and destructive of each other. Ministers were turned out because the House of Commons would not follow them after they had lost Lord Althorpe, and then the House of Commons was turned out because it would follow them too much although Lord Althorpe had left them. The reason, and the only reason for getting rid of the late parliament, was, that the late ministers were still its favourites, and that the new ministers durst not allow that House to meet ; knowing, as well as he knew, that their first vote would have been, not that they could no longer trust the late ministers because of the loss of Lord Althorpe, but that although they regretted that event, they still confided in them. Lord Brougham then pronounced a long invective against what he considered the inconsistency between the former policy of the members of the existing administration, and that which they now professed

themselves willing to adopt. It was the result, perhaps not more of reason and experience than of a sort of instinct, that men mistrusted all sudden, unaccountable, and miraculous conversions, of which this was one. That a man who had been the enemy of change, and the vituperator of all innovations—who had confounded with revolution, anarchy, and political insanity, if not depravity, any attempt to touch even one of the outworks of any of the venerable institutions of the country,—who had signalized these opinions by years of uninterrupted hostility to every species of reform, and whose protests had stigmatized it in the boldest terms on their lordship's journals; that such a man—without any event having happened, or any change in public affairs—should have so decided a change produced upon him all at once, appeared to him one of the most unaccountable phenomena in human nature which he had ever been called on to contemplate. This was the Duke of Wellington's second conversion; and Lord Lyndhurst likewise had given an example of the nimbleness with which he could be converted. It was always suspicious when people changed their principles and gained something. In some cases it might certainly be a proof of magnanimity and honest devotion to the public well-being; but that was a case which should occur only once in a statesman's life. A man might once get himself into that false position, and expose himself with impunity to such a load of suspicion; but assuredly no weight of reputation, and no amount of public service, would ever enable a man with impunity to play the same game twice. No man had rejoiced more than himself in the conversion of those who now formed the ministry to the cause of Catholic emancipation; but he freely confessed that, on that occasion, he had been a dupe. He maintained, therefore, that in the present government, no confidence could be placed. They asked for a trial; but they had been on trial all their lives, and had been found not only wanting in reform, but its bitterest opponents.

The lord chancellor, after repelling the insinuations of

Lord Brougham, that the ministry which had carried the Catholic question had abandoned their principles on that occasion for the sake of retaining their offices, which, in fact, were endangered by the course which they then adopted, adverted to the responsibility which the present ministers were supposed to have incurred, in having virtually advised the dismissal of their predecessors by having consented to succeed them. He referred to Earl Grey's declared wish to resign, when Lord Stanley and his friends seceded from the ministry; to his actual resignation merely because he found it impossible to carry on the government without having Lord Althorpe in the Lower House, and to the confession of Lord Melbourne when he formed the late ministry, that he had been able to do so only in consequence of Lord Althorpe having been prevailed on to resume his place as leader in the Commons. All these matters, continued Lord Lyndhurst, were well known to his majesty; and more followed; for when Lord Althorpe was removed to the House of Peers, Lord Melbourne went to the king to state the fact—told him that the foundation on which the cabinet had been formed had been taken away, and that it was for his majesty to say, in this new and altered state of circumstances, whether he would refer to other counsel, or whether his lordship should endeavour to reform the government. The sovereign, therefore, and by the sovereign he meant the new ministers, had to consider whether the government so proposed to be formed again was likely to be permanent. If his majesty was convinced of the contrary, and that it might break up at a time when its dissolution might be productive of much more mischief than it was calculated to occasion at that particular moment, was the king not justified in changing his ministers? It was in vain to talk of the dissolved ministry having enjoyed the confidence of the country. Few measures of the crown had ever given more satisfaction than its dismissal. A meeting had been called at Manchester to address the crown in favour of the late ministers: and what took place? In an assembly of 10,000 persons, an amend-

ment was carried to thank his majesty for what he had done. Several other instances of the same kind had taken place. On what ground was it, then, that the late ministers stated themselves to have been firm in the confidence of the country? Still more strange was the charge of having dissolved parliament; for Lord Brougham, in the same breath in which he made his dissolution matter of blame, declared that the new government would have found it impossible to go on with the old parliament. If it was so, there was the justification of the dissolution.

The lord chancellor next referred to the blame thrown on the Duke of Wellington, as having usurped all the great offices of the state. It was necessary, he said, either that the old government should have remained in power till the return of Sir Robert Peel, or that a new government should be formed provisionally. If the former course had been adopted, where would the new government have been? The late ministers would have used their continued power only to prevent a new ministry from being formed. Even as it was, symptoms of that kind had shown themselves. No lord chancellor had ever been in the habit of inserting names in the commissions of the peace without consulting the lord-lieutenants of the respective counties; but Lord Brougham, when he was out of office, did that which he could not have done if he had been in office,—he had sent for the commissions of six counties, and made out the fiats for the insertion of certain names, not only without application to the lord-lieutenants of the counties, but in direct opposition to their known wishes. He did not say that this proceeding was absolutely illegal; but was it right that such powers should be left in the hands of ministers who would exercise them even after their removal from office? It was necessary that the government should be taken up by some person; and who more fit for the task than the Duke of Wellington? There were repeated instances of such a plurality of offices. Lord Liverpool had been first lord of the treasury and secretary of state at the same time. When

the chancellorship of the exchequer was vacant, who was to hold the seals? The law itself said, the lord chief justice of the King's Bench, who also held another high office. He himself, too, had taken on this occasion the great seal, while he was still chief baron of the exchequer; but in that there was nothing illegal; nay, Lord Brougham himself had told him to do it, and had declared to him it was the best course he could take.

In the Commons, also, there was a long and obstinate contest. Lord Morpeth moved an amendment to the address, proposing that words should be substituted, "expressing a trust that his majesty's councils would be directed in a spirit of well-considered and effective reform, and that in the same liberal and comprehensive policy which had dictated the reform of the representation and the abolition of negro slavery: that the municipal corporations would be placed under vigilant popular control; all the well-founded grievances of the Protestant dissenters removed; and the abuses in the church, which impair its efficacy in England, and disturb the peace of society in Ireland, corrected: also representing to his majesty that his faithful Commons begged submissively to add, that they could not but lament that the progress of these and other reforms should have been unnecessarily interrupted and endangered by the dissolution of the late parliament." 'This amendment being seconded by Mr. Bannerman, gave rise to a debate which lasted three nights. The principal speakers for the original address were Messrs. Pemberton and Richards, Sir Robert Peel, Lord Stanley, Messrs. Robinson, Goulburn, and Praed, Mr. Serjeant Goulburn and Sir James Graham; for the amendment, Messrs. Grote, Poulter, and Ward, Dr. Lushington, Lord John Russell, Messrs. Harvey, Fox Maule, and Gisborne, Lord Howick, Mr. T. Duncombe, and Mr. O'Connell. On a division the opposition had a majority of seven in an assembly of 625 members; when Sir Robert Peel insinuated that it was possible he might take the sense of the House again on the question of bringing up a report; but next evening he stated that, after having made

due inquiries, he felt convinced he could not succeed in that measure. It was understood, indeed, that Sir Robert would not have been supported in it by Lord Stanley, who, in the course of the debate, declared that he would go the whole length of the amendment on the subject of corporation reform. His lordship also said, that the omission of any particular notice of that subject, both in the speech from the throne and the exposition of ministerial intentions, which Sir Robert had given to the House, induced him to regard the government with a more jealous eye than he should otherwise have been inclined to view it. Lord Howick stated, he did not consider that the necessary effect of carrying the amendment would be to remove the present administration; for he should scarcely give the vote he intended to give, if it were likely to have that result; but though he did not desire the immediate retirement of Sir Robert Peel and his colleagues, he should regard it as a great calamity if the present government continued without any change.

On the 28th, when the order of the day was read for the House going into a committee of supply, the premier stated, in answer to questions put by Lord John Russell, that he had not felt it his duty, in consequence of the vote on the address, to tender his resignation. Sir Robert further said, that, with respect to the church, he was still of opinion that ecclesiastical property ought not to be diverted from ecclesiastical purposes, although any measures not inconsistent with this principle should have his best consideration; that he had no motive or intention to obstruct corporation reform; and, finally, that in regard to a rumour which had been spread abroad about another dissolution, and an alleged intention of government, in case the Mutiny Bill should not pass, to keep up a standing army in defiance of parliament—the first he never sanctioned directly or indirectly, and the second he never heard a whisper of until it fell from Lord John Russell's own lips.

The majority of the opposition party was still mainly dependent on the Irish members, who had by no means



improved in moderation. The following evening was occupied by discussions respecting the state of Ireland and bribery at elections; but the sitting on Wednesday produced a debate which was of much greater importance to the stability of the administration. This arose from a question put,—Whether it was true that 182 addresses from Orange Societies had been presented to the king, and whether answers had not been returned to the parties, stating that the addresses had been most graciously received? The question seemed to take ministers by surprise; and the only defence they offered to the charge of returning such answers to Protestant Societies, alleged to be illegal, was, that the illegality of the Orange Lodges had never been judicially declared; and that the addresses had been received and answered, merely according to the usual form. On the following Friday, Mr. Shiel moved for the production of copies of the said Orange addresses; also for the copy of a letter written by Lord Manners when Chancellor of Ireland relative to the illegality of Orange Societies, and for the opinions of the Irish attorney and solicitor general on the same point. The latter part of this motion was resisted by ministers; and it was finally withdrawn; but the production of the addresses and answers was agreed to.

On Tuesday the 10th, in a very full house, the Marquess of Chandos moved his resolution for the repeal of the malt-tax. The debate lasted till near one o'clock in the morning. Sir Robert Peel delivered an admirable and most convincing speech. The numbers upon a division were 192 for the resolution, and 350 against it. On this occasion most of the adherents of the late Whig ministry voted in the majority. Mr. Charles Wood declared he was happy to give the present government that support which he and his friends had received in similar circumstances from Sir Robert Peel.

A terrible storm was raised by the rumoured appointment of Lord Londonderry as ambassador at the court of St. Petersburg. The Irish members saw in this appointment nothing but a proof that ministers intended to

forward the designs of despotism and tyranny. On the 13th of March, Mr. Shiel moved an address to his majesty for a copy of any appointment made within the last four months of an ambassador from the court of London to St. Petersburg, and of the salary and emoluments attached to such embassy. He entered into a statement of the aggrandizing policy which Russia had been pursuing towards Persia and Turkey. He blamed the English government for not having interfered on behalf of Turkey during the war between her and Russia, which was terminated by the peace of Adrianople in 1829; and disapproved of the conduct of the late ministers in not having stopped the progress of Ibrahim Pasha in 1833, and in allowing a Russian army to be landed on the Asiatic side of the Bosphorus. By the treaty in Constantinople, in 1833, ratified by that of St. Petersburg in January, 1834, Russia had gained great advantages. Turkey was now united with her defensively and offensively. If Russia went to war with England, Turkey would be compelled to do the same, and the English would find the Dardanelles closed against them. Russia had likewise assembled a large army on the frontiers of Persia, where she seemed to be only waiting a pretext for invasion. In the west of Europe the influence of that power was felt in every cabinet, tending to countervail the great principle to which Englishmen were attached. From these considerations he inferred the great importance of a proper person being appointed to the embassy at St. Petersburg. He clearly ought to be wise, sagacious, firm, and discreet. He should be inflexibly attached to those principles to which the great mass of the people of this country were devoted, qualified to protect the commercial interests, and to represent, in his own calm dignity, the honour of this empire, and, perhaps it might be added, to raise his voice in favour of neglected and unfortunate Poland. Lord Londonderry did not possess these qualities. He might be qualified to act as an orator in the county of Down, but was not competent to perform the part of a diplomatist at St. Petersburg.

Mr. Cutler Ferguson likewise objected to the appointment, principally on account of the opinion which the marquess had expressed in regard to Poland. He had no objections to the appointment, he said, of a personal nature. He opposed it on public grounds. Last year the Marquess of Londonderry had expressed himself in the House of Lords to the following effect:—"Russia was perfectly justified in taking her own line in regard to Turkey, after we had conceived ourselves justified in taking a separate and distinct line from the other parties to the treaty of Vienna with regard to the Belgian question." And as to the encouragement given to the emperor's subjects of Poland, he believed that noble person to be the first individual who in this country had ventured to call the Poles rebels. A constitution, an independent kingdom, and a sovereignty had been given to them, to which they had as much right as the Emperor of Russia to his crown. That sovereign was bound to maintain the nationality of Poland by the treaty of Vienna, to which the ambassadors of all the powers of Europe had affixed their seals; and that treaty had been shamelessly violated by the Russian autocrat. The Poles were not rebels; they had been driven into resistance. He did not ask that any person should be sent to St. Petersburg to remonstrate with Russia on her conduct towards Poland; the time for such a proceeding had perhaps gone by: but of this he was convinced—that we ought not to send as ambassador one who had spoken of the Poles in the terms which he had stated. That house had admitted, and the late foreign secretary had admitted, that the resistance of the Poles to Russia was justifiable. Ought, then, a person to be sent as ambassador to Russia who entertained a decided feeling against the cause of that gallant, but unfortunate, nation, and who maintained that the British government had already gone too far in its favour? It ought to be the business of our ambassador at St. Petersburg to endeavour, as far as possible, to mitigate the fate of these unfortunate people, who were at present suffering from proscription, confiscation, and banishment on account of

a revolution which he deemed to have been perfectly justifiable. But this, unfortunately, was not the opinion of the nobleman to whom rumour assigned the Russian embassy.

Lord Stanley expressed similar opinions. As the appointment had not been formally made out, the motion of course would fall, but he trusted that, in deference to the feelings of the people of England, ministers would revoke, even at that last hour, an appointment, which he could not think creditable to the government, or acceptable to the country. The Marquess of Londonderry, who had declared his opinion to be unfavourable to the Poles, was the last person whom England should send to Russia. If it was now too late, as he believed it was, to exercise any active interposition in favour of Poland, much might still be done by the known character and the quiet and constant influence of an ambassador truly representing the feelings of the people, and, he believed, of the sovereign of England. The intended ambassador might have instructions to act upon; but would these instructions counterbalance his known sentiments? He would not say that his efforts would be exercised in stimulating to actual severities, but whether would they bear the impress of his own feelings, or of those of the people of this country, might be questionable. He earnestly hoped that the prime minister, to whose inclinations he believed the appointment to be foreign, would allow the feelings of the house and of the country to have their influence on the counsels of the government.

Sir Robert Peel said he was in no degree surprised that the intended appointment had occasioned dissatisfaction on the opposite side of the house; for no one appointment of the government had as yet produced in that quarter any satisfaction. He had taken the attorney-general for Ireland of the late government, but even that was objected to. The appointment, too, of paymaster of the forces had been blamed; yet it had been confidently stated, and not contradicted, that Earl Grey's government had offered to that very gentleman

the office of secretary at war. He had not a doubt, therefore, of the appointment of Lord Londonderry being unsatisfactory to those whose policy he opposed; but he wanted to know, from the course of the present debate, what were the allegations which had been made against Lord Londonderry? What was there in the shape of a substantive allegation against him, excepting that one which had been brought forward by Mr. Ferguson—namely, that Lord Londonderry had expressed an opinion that the late government had pushed their interference on behalf of the Poles to an unjustifiable extent—and had made use of an expression, “That the Poles were rebellious subjects.” With respect to the particular observation said to have been used by Lord Londonderry, he knew not whether that expression had been used or not; but he thought it scarcely fair that any gentleman should come down to that house with particular scraps of speeches delivered in another place, and condemn the noble lord upon those extracts. In a version of the noble lord’s speech which he then held in his hand, published more recently, and contained in a very careful report of that debate, not a word of such expression was to be found. He would not deny the expression, but certainly he could not find it. To judge of individuals, however, by the language they might use in the excitement of a debate, was not a fair criterion by which to try a public man. Did they not all in that house, in the warmth of the moment, and excited by party feeling, for the purpose of criminating a government to which they were hostile, use expressions which in calmer moments they never could be prepared to support? Did not instances of that sort take place every night? And was it fair, therefore, in this manner, to come down against a public man with a single extract from a speech which it was said he had at some time or other delivered? Lord Londonderry was on the staff of the Duke of Wellington from 1809 to 1813, and filled the office of adjutant-general during that time. No doubt, although many might admit his gallantry and devotion to the service, they might say that this was no

conclusive proof of his general ability; yet if he had filled the office of adjutant-general for four years during the Peninsular campaign, without there having been one charge brought against him, that was no insignificant proof of his good character. Lord Londonderry had besides served in a diplomatic character from the year 1813 until the year 1823. He was appointed minister to Berlin in April 1813; he was appointed ambassador to Vienna in 1814, and he retired from the service in 1823 at his own request. Surely, the question, after all, was the manner in which he had conducted himself, not indeed in his military capacity, not even in his office of adjutant-general, although that office had civil as well as military duties connected with it, but in his diplomatic situation, which he had held with the utmost credit to himself in Vienna, during a very critical time, for a period of ten years. Mr. Canning, on his appointment to office, received the cordial support of gentlemen opposite on the ground of his foreign policy. They overlooked his opinion on some points of domestic policy, and it was upon his general conduct with respect to foreign affairs that the House was prepared to give his government a fair trial. He was speaking of an early period of the life of Mr. Canning; but no public minister, no man who had served his country, could be but proud of such a testimony to his qualifications and abilities as that which he was about to read. When Lord Londonderry expressed his wish to resign the situation he held at Vienna, this was the letter he received from Mr. Canning:—"My lord—Having laid before the king your excellency's despatch of the 26th ult., requesting his majesty's gracious permission to retire from the eminent post of his majesty's ambassador at the court of Vienna, I have received his majesty's commands to signify to your excellency the permission which your excellency solicits, accompanied with the expression of his majesty's deep regret for the loss of your excellency's services, and of his full and entire approbation of the manner in which your excellency has, for a series of years, and in times

of the most critical importance, conducted the affairs of the embassy intrusted to your charge, and maintained the intimate, cordial, and good understanding so happily subsisting between his majesty and his imperial ally." This was the testimony borne by Mr. Canning to the conduct of Lord Londonderry. Yet his lordship was to be excluded from the public service on account of a single expression said to have been used on one particular occasion. If the opposition should think it expedient to make a precedent of interposing between the exercise of the king's prerogative with respect to the appointment of an ambassador, the House might rest assured the precedent would not stop there. He had no wish to underrate the objection, but if the other side of the House had a majority, he would say to them, their better course would be to attack the government at once—to ask the crown to remove the government. If government was entirely without the confidence of the majority of the house, why did that majority not address the crown for its instant removal? Surely it would be much better to take that course than to attempt to lower the prerogative of the crown, by the House of Commons assuming to itself undue powers, and interfering with appointments which properly belong to the crown. Sir John Cam Hobhouse replied to Sir Robert Peel, insisting that the prime minister having in his manifesto to the electors of Tamworth, in the king's speech, and in his explanatory address in that house, intimated his determination to adhere to the foreign policy of the late government, it would be imprudent, indiscreet, if he sent to St. Petersburg a nobleman entertaining the opinions which the Marquess of Londonderry was known to entertain.

As the motion was for the production of a copy of the appointment, and no appointment had been made out, the motion itself was withdrawn; but the effect of the discussion, although Sir Robert Peel had declared himself ready to maintain the nomination, was to induce the Marquess of Londonderry to decline the situation. The debate in the Commons was published on Saturday the

14th; on the following Monday, his lordship stated in the House of Peers, that he felt, so soon as he had read the discussion in the other House of Parliament, that he had but one course to follow, as a good subject, and one attached to the public service. Situated as he now was, were he to depart from this country after what had passed in the House of Commons, he should feel himself, as a representative of majesty, placed in a new, a false, and an improper position. He would go with the remarks and animadversions of one branch of the legislature so strongly imprinted on him, that his efficiency would be impaired, and it would be impossible for him to fill the office to which he had been called with proper dignity and effect. It was on these grounds, standing, as he did, upon his sense of duty to his sovereign, and not meaning to succumb to faction, though he should be devoid of feeling if he were insensible to the scoffs and scorn with which he had been so unjustly attacked, that he had determined, upon no consideration whatever, to accept of the appointment. He had had no communication directly or indirectly with the government. He had neither sought advice, nor had advice been proffered. He had taken this position firmly and after due deliberation. The Duke of Wellington, besides defending the appointment, and acknowledging the delicacy which had led Lord Londonderry to withdraw rather than injure or embarrass the public service, questioned the legality of what the House of Commons had seemed inclined to do. There was no part of the prerogative of the crown so important as that of sending ambassadors to foreign courts; nor was there any branch of that prerogative which ought to be kept more inviolate. But the ministers of the crown were responsible for those nominations. They were responsible for the instructions under which ambassadors were bound to act. They were, moreover, responsible for the proper performance of those duties (by the ambassadors whom they selected) to the other House of Parliament, and to the country at large. It was impossible, therefore, for him to believe that the House of Commons would proceed so far as to

interfere with that peculiar prerogative, and to say that the person nominated should not fill the situation, inasmuch as, by so doing, the House of Commons would not only take upon itself the nomination of the officer, and the direction of the particular duties which he was to discharge, but would also relieve the minister from the constitutional responsibility of the appointment. He did not think that sentiments of such a description were general; and he could not bring himself to believe that a vote, affirming such a violation of the royal prerogative, would have passed the House of Commons.

The ministry was clearly going to pieces; but the premier introduced his measure for the relief of persons dissenting from the established church in regard to the celebration of marriage. The chancellor presented the first report of the commissioners appointed to inquire into the state of the established church; and Sir Henry Hardinge, in the Commons, brought forward the ministerial plan for settling the Irish tithe question. The plan was this: that in future Irish tithes shall be recoverable only from the chief landlord, or person having the first estate of inheritance in the land; that the owner shall be entitled to demand only seventy-five per cent. on the amount to which he at present has a right; that the tithe shall be redeemable by the landlord at twenty years' purchase, calculated on the diminished rate; that the proceeds thus arising shall be invested in land or otherwise, for the benefit of the tithe-owners; that present incumbents shall be indemnified against any loss accruing in the amount of their incomes below the seventy-five per cent., but that their successors shall receive only the income, whatever it may be, which the investment shall produce; that all litigation for the recovery of tithes due shall be carried on through the incorporated commissioners of the ecclesiastical fund; that the repayment of sums granted under the Million act shall not be called for; but that the residue of that sum shall be farther distributed among tithe-owners, in lieu of tithes due to them for the year 1834, which they have not been able to collect.

A long debate followed the proposal of these resolu-

tions. Lord John Russell contended, that in principle they were perfectly identical with the bill brought in last session by the late ministers, and which had been thrown out in the House of Lords by the present government and their friends: his lordship said that of course he had no opposition to offer to the measure. Mr. O'Connell, on the contrary, endeavoured to show that the two measures were entirely dissimilar: in point of fact the main distinctions between them appeared to be, that the bill of last session made the landlords a present of two-fifths of the tithes, or of 40*l.* in every 100*l.*; securing to the clergyman seventy-seven and a half per cent. of his legal income, and devolving an annual charge equal to seventeen and a half per cent. of the whole tithes on the consolidated fund; while it was now proposed to give the landlords only one-fourth of the tithes; to secure to the clergyman only seventy-five per cent. of his legal income, and to devolve no charge on the consolidated fund. In the course of the debate such strong objections were taken to the clauses dispensing with the repayment of the sums distributed and to be distributed under the Million act, that ministers consented to withdraw them. On the 23rd the report of the committee was brought up, and the bill, embodying the resolutions which had been agreed to, was read a first time; when Sir R. Peel intimated that he should move for the reinsertion of the rejected clauses relating to the Million act when the measure had arrived at a subsequent stage. In the course of a conversation which arose out of this subject, Mr. Barron denounced what he described as inconsistency and abandonment of principle in Sir R. Peel and his colleagues, whom he charged with being merely actuated with a base desire of office: for these expressions the honourable member was directed by the Speaker to apologize to the House, which he accordingly did. Mr. Finn then brought forward his motion for a select committee to inquire into the nature, extent, and tendency of Orange lodges, which was agreed to without a division.

On Tuesday the 24th, in the House of Lords, a select committee was appointed, on the motion of the Duke of

Richmond, to consider the subject of prison discipline in England and Wales; and the same evening in the Commons, the House having resolved itself into a committee, Sir R. Peel brought forward his plan for effecting a commutation of tithes in England by a voluntary agreement between the owner and payer of tithe in each parish; when, after a short debate, a resolution, embodying the leading principle of the plan, was agreed to. On the 26th, Mr. Tooke moved that an address should be presented to the crown, to grant a charter to the London University; and, after a debate of some length, the motion was carried against ministers by a majority of 246 to 110. His majesty's answer, which was returned in a few days, stated that the address had been laid before the privy council, and that he would, without delay, call for a report of its proceedings, in order that he might be enabled to judge of the best means of carrying into effect the wishes of his faithful Commons.

On the 27th, the army and ordnance estimates were carried by large majorities, though not without a fierco struggle with Mr. Hume and his partisans; and on Monday the 30th, after the House had been called over, Lord John Russell brought forward his motion on the Irish church in the form of a resolution:—"That the House should resolve itself into a committee of the whole House to consider respecting the temporalities of the church of Ireland." A debate ensued, which was continued by adjournments over the three following nights. The House divided at three o'clock in the morning of Friday the 4th of April, when there appeared for the motion 322, and against it 289. On the evening of the same day the House went into committee on the motion of Lord John, who moved—"That it is the opinion of this committee, that any surplus which may remain, after fully providing for the spiritual instruction of the members of the established church in Ireland, ought to be applied to the general education of all classes of Christians." When the debate had continued for some time, Mr. Peter Borthwick moved an adjournment, but the motion was negatived. Shortly after, however, the House adjourned

to Monday the 6th. On that day the debate was resumed, and the resolution was finally carried by 262 against 237. The House then went into committee on the navy estimates. On Tuesday the 7th, the report of the committee on the Irish church was brought up, when Lord John Russell rose and moved—"That it is the opinion of this House, that no measure on the subject of tithes in Ireland can lead to a satisfactory and final adjustment, which does not embody the principle contained in the foregoing resolution." The House divided after another long debate, when 285 voted with Lord John, and 258 against him.

In all these divisions, it was the collective weight of the Irish Catholic members that told on the side of the opposition.

The House of Commons having thus declared the intention of insisting on certain measures, to which they were to request the concurrence of the crown, and in which the present administration could not advise the crown to give that concurrence, ministers resigned on the following day. Sir Robert Peel stated, that he and his colleagues, by an unanimous determination, had placed their offices at the disposal of the king. "I do not hesitate," he continued, "to say that we have taken this course with the utmost reluctance, and not without the deepest conviction of its necessity. Being in possession of the entire confidence of the king, and having received from his majesty the most cordial and unremitting support—looking to the present position of public affairs, and the present state of political parties—looking to, not only the numerical, but the moral strength of that great party by which we have had the honour of being supported, we felt it was our duty, under existing circumstances, to continue the attempt of administering public affairs, as the responsible advisers of the crown, to the latest moment that was consistent with the interests of the public service, and with the honour and character of public men. When I do not hesitate to avow that reluctance, I believe I shall have great credit with a great majority of the House of Commons, that it arose from

public considerations alone, and was wholly unconnected with everything of a personal nature. I have a strong impression, that when a public man, at a crisis of great importance, undertakes the public trust of administering the government of this country, he incurs an obligation to persevere as long as it is possible for him to do so—that no indifference to public life, no disgust with the labours which it imposes, no personal mortification, no deference to private feeling, should sanction a public man in withdrawing, on light grounds, from the post in which the favour of his sovereign has placed him. But, at the same time, there is an evil in exhibiting to the crown the want on the part of the government of that support in the House of Commons which should enable it satisfactorily to conduct the public affairs, and to exercise over the House the legitimate and necessary control conferred by the possession of its confidence. Considering all that has occurred since the commencement of the present session—the little progress we have been able to make from the want of the support and confidence of the House—that ministers have had the misfortune, on each of four successive nights, to be left in a minority, although on that question they had received the support of those who, not having a general and unlimited confidence in the government, yet have given it their cordial and honourable assistance on every occasion on which it was consistent with their public principles to give it. Adverting to all these considerations, in my opinion, the time is come when it is incumbent on us to withdraw from the responsibility which office, under such circumstances, imposes. The vote, too, of last night implies, I conceive, a want of confidence in his majesty's government; because, in my opinion, it was not necessary, for any public purpose, to come to that vote. It was tantamount to a declaration, that the House has not that confidence in the present government which would entitle its members to submit to the consideration of the House the measures of which they had given notice. An intention has been announced likewise, if that vote did not lead to the result which it had led to, to follow it up with an address

to the crown. As embarrassment to public affairs would have arisen from the presentation of that address. I have been anxious to give this explanation in a manner the least calculated to give offence or to excite angry feelings. For myself, the whole of my political life has been spent in the House of Commons—the remainder of it shall be spent there; and whatever may be the conflicts of parties, I, for one, would always wish to stand well with the House, whether in a majority or in a minority. Under no circumstances, under the pressure of no weight, would I ever have advised the crown to resign that great source of moral strength which consists in a strict adherence to the practice, to the principle, to the letter, and to the spirit of the constitution of the country. That adherence will be the surest safeguard against any impending danger; and it is because I entertain that belief, that I consider that a government ought not to persist in carrying on public affairs, after a fair trial, against the decided opinion of a majority of the House of Commons. Although I sincerely regret the necessity which has compelled me to abandon his majesty's service at the present moment, yet, upon the balance of public consideration, I feel that I have taken a course which is more likely to sustain the character of a public man, and promote the ultimate interests of the country, than if I had persevered in what I believe would have been a fruitless attempt, in the face of the opposition which has hitherto obstructed the satisfactory progress of public business, while I and my colleagues have been in office."

Both Houses remained inactive until the 18th, when Lord Melbourne announced in the Lords that he had been appointed first lord of the treasury, and that the new administration was formed. To a question asked by Lord Alvanley the new premier replied, that he did not know whether he should have the assistance of Mr. O'Connell or not, but that he had taken no means to secure it, and had entered into no terms whatever with that honourable and learned gentleman. His lordship added, that to Mr. O'Connell's opinions, in favour of a

repeal of the union and the abolition of the House of Peers, he was entirely opposed. The House then adjourned to the 30th of April, but on an understanding that no public business should be undertaken till the 12th of May. The same evening, in the Commons, there was a motion for new writs on account of vacancies occasioned by the appointment of seventeen members of the House to offices under the crown; and the Commons also adjourned to the 12th of May.

This was the construction of the new cabinet:—Viscount Melbourne, first lord of the treasury; Lord Palmerston, Lord J. Russell, and Mr. C. Grant, secretaries respectively for the foreign, home, and colonial departments; Lord Lansdowne, president of the council; Lord Duncannon, privy seal and chief commissioner of woods and forests; Lord Auckland, first lord of the admiralty; Sir J. C. Hobhouse and Mr. Poulett Thompson, presidents of the board of control and of trade; Lord Howick secretary at war, Lord Holland chancellor of the duchy of Lancaster; and Mr. Spring Rice, chancellor of the exchequer. Sir John Campbell and Mr. R. M. Rolfe were made attorney and solicitor-general; and Mr. Cutler Ferguson, judge advocate; the Earl of Mulgrave went as lord lieutenant to advance the popularity of ministers in Ireland, where Lord Plunkett was made chancellor, and Lord Morpeth chief secretary, with Mr. Serjeant Perrin and Mr. O'Loughlin as attorney and solicitor-general. The lord-advocate of Scotland was Mr. J. A. Murray. Among other appointments were those of Sir Henry Parnell as paymaster of the forces and treasurer of the navy; the Marquess of Conyngham, postmaster-general, and Marquess Wellesley, lord chamberlain. The great seal was not restored to Lord Brougham: for the present it was put in commission, the commissioners being Sir Charles Pepys, master of the rolls; Sir Lancelot Shadwell, vice-chancellor; and Mr. Justice Bosanquet.

In the interim, the new ministers who belonged to the House of Commons had to be re-elected; and, although they were in general successful, they encoun-

tered failures, some of which were extremely discouraging, and gave symptoms of the alarm which they had excited in the public mind. Mr. Littleton being raised to the peerage by the title of Lord Hatherton, a vacancy occurred in the county of Stafford. A conservative candidate took the field, and was returned. Mr. Charles Grant was likewise called to the House of Lords as Baron Glenelg; and the Scotch county of Inverness, for which he had been chosen at the general election, immediately returned a conservative candidate. But the severest stroke of all occurred in the case of Lord John Russell himself. He again presented himself to the electors of the southern division of Devonshire: Mr. Parker took the field against him, and beat the secretary of state by a majority of 627 votes. These three elections disposed of six out of the seven votes which had carried the amendment on the address. Lord John Russell did not procure a seat till after parliament had re-assembled, Colonel Fox, member for Stroud, accepted the Chiltern Hundreds in his favour, and became secretary to the ordnance. By a similar negotiation, Mr. Kennedy, member for Tiverton, made room for Lord Palmerston. In Yorkshire, Lord Morpeth was opposed, but carried his election by a very great majority.

When the new ministers proceeded to explain what they intended to do, it was found that the only measures which they meant to bring forward, were a bill for the reform of municipal corporations, and a bill regarding tithes in Ireland, founded on the late resolutions of the Commons. Nothing was to be done in relation to the dissenters. The bill brought in by Sir Robert Peel, and which the dissenters had received with so much satisfaction, was to be dropped: no other was to be proposed in its place; for Lord John Russell had not had time to consider the details of the measure, which he thought would require considerable alterations in order to effect its purpose, or to make up his mind as to the changes which he would be inclined to adopt. There was to be no measure of English ecclesiastical reform, nor any use made of the commission which the late ministry

had appointed for that purpose. Commutation of tithes in England and the conversion or abolition of church-rates were not to be brought forward. Lord John Russell said, that if he had learned anything by the experience of the last three years, during which he had been a member of the government, it was that they frequently fell into difficulties by undertaking too great a multiplicity of matters, so that there were questions with which, at the end of the session, they could not proceed from want of sufficient time for due consideration. He was perfectly inclined to consider any question that had been brought before the house by the late ministry ; but still he would not undertake, on the part of the government, to go farther than municipal reform in England and Wales and the regulation of tithes in Ireland. The new opposition admitted that it was much wiser to proceed with caution than bring forward measures hastily, to abandon them as hastily. But, they asked, Did you not complain, in the amendment which you carried upon the address, that besides the questions of municipal corporations and Irish tithes, "the progress of other reforms had been interrupted and endangered by the unnecessary dissolution of a parliament earnestly intent upon their prosecution?" These other reforms undoubtedly meant commutation of tithes, abolition of church-rates, and the removal of some, at least, of the grievances of the dissenters. It now turned out that, instead of these having been endangered or interrupted by the accession of the late ministry, that ministry was prepared to have brought them all forward ; and they were to be laid aside, in the meantime, by the new administration, who had complained that their progress would be stopped.

Great changes in the mode of electing municipal authorities and in the general government of borough-affairs had become inevitable from and after the passing of the Reform Bill. It was difficult to exclude from the election of their new town-councils the inhabitants of boroughs who were everywhere trusted with the election of the members of the legislature. The boroughs of

Scotland had already undergone this system of purification, without even waiting for the report of a commission of inquiry. The election of the magistrates and the town councillors had been vested in the ten-pound householders. England had been more leisurely dealt with. In accordance with a recommendation of a committee of the House of Commons in 1833, a commission had been appointed to inquire into the state of corporations in England and Wales. In the royal speech at the prorogation of parliament in that year, the object of the commission had been thus stated:—"The result of its inquiries will enable you to mature those measures which may seem best fitted to place the internal government of corporate cities and towns upon a solid foundation in respect to their finances, their judicature, and their police;" and in the speech at the opening of last session, his majesty had said, in reference to the expected reports, "they cannot fail to afford you much useful information, by which you will be enabled to judge of the nature and extent of any existing defects and abuses, and in what manner the necessary corrections may, in due season, be safely and beneficially applied." On the 5th of June Lord John Russell detailed the plan of municipal government which ministers intended to provide for 183 corporations, including a population of more than 2,000,000. He maintained that, having extended considerably to the people the right of choosing the members of the legislature, the inferior right of choosing their own local authorities could not consistently be withheld. Hitherto there had been a close monopoly of those local authorities. A few persons composing the corporation for their own benefit were connected with a portion of the lower classes of the people, whose votes they bought, whose habits they demoralized. The abuses resulting from this were enormous. In the distribution of the charity funds of such places it would be found that two-thirds or three-fourths of the whole were distributed to those who belonged to the governing body. It would appear in the case of some of the corporations that funds intended to be used for the general

benefit of the towns, were partly devoted to the private benefit of individuals, partly applied to defray the expense of feasts and entertainments provided for the mayors, corporations, and municipal officers.

Many difficulties presented themselves in settling the boundaries of the boroughs, and in deciding whether the right of such settling belonged to the legislature or to the crown. Sir Robert Peel complained of the too strong democratic spirit of the measure—complained that ministers did not undertake to alter the reform bill explicitly, but were proceeding to effect their purpose indirectly. He had always prophesied, when his friends expressed their willingness to accept the reform bill as our constitutional charter, and to abide by it, that any proposal for its modification was much more likely to come from the authors of the measure than from its opponents. The question was carried entirely by the majority of Scotch and Irish members. Among the English members there was, on one division, a majority of 15 against ministers. On the 20th of July the bill was read a third time and passed, without any farther division. In the House of Lords counsel were heard against the bill, and several very important alterations were made in it. The most important clause they inserted was one preserving the rights of property and parliamentary franchise of the freemen. The Commons debated long upon some of the alterations, but, on the 7th of September, they agreed to the bill as it had been returned to them from the Lords; and in that shape it was finally passed.

Lord Morpeth introduced a Bill for regulating the Irish church, by suppressing benefices to create a surplus, &c. The bill passed the Commons; but the Lords, though agreeing to some of the clauses, stickled at the appropriation of the funds; and ministers were compelled to abandon the bill.

The presbyterian or established church of Scotland, finding the means of spiritual instruction, in many places, very disproportionate to the amount of the population, had made application to former governments to a very limited extent, and their application had been favourably

entertained. Mr. P. M. Stewart stated in the House of Commons, on the 20th of May, that he had been one of a deputation who had waited on Lord Brougham, when lord chancellor, and Lord Melbourne, regarding this matter within the last two years; and the impression made on himself, as well as on all the other members of the deputation, had been, that these two noblemen were favourable to the grant. The request, indeed, was a very moderate one. All that was done, however, was to appoint a commission, composed of persons who were Whigs or more than Whigs; the Earl of Minto, Mr. Mountstuart Elphinstone, and the member for the county of Dumfries, being considered as merely the ornamental part of the commission. This gave great offence to the General Assembly, who passed an all but unanimous resolution—"That the commission of the General Assembly feel it incumbent on them, in the discharge of their duty to the church of Scotland, to state to the government the sentiments they entertain of the constitution of the commission; that they do not consider it entirely friendly to the church, individual members having publicly professed opposition to the connexion between church and state; and farther, that with few exceptions, it does not contain the names of individuals of experience, or men interested in the church, and that on those grounds the commission is not entitled to the confidence of the church." This resolution, however, produced no change in the composition of the commission. The great body of the kirk, though dissatisfied with the conduct of government, would not give their adversaries any advantage by appearing to be afraid of inquiry or of the commissioners. They held another meeting of the commission of the Assembly on the 30th of September. It was attended by no fewer than 155 members, of whom 85 were clergymen, and 70 lay elders. They unanimously passed the following resolution:—"The commission having maturely deliberated on the instructions to the royal commissioners for inquiring into the means of religious instruction and pastoral superintendence afforded to the people of Scotland, express their deep regret that his majesty's minis-

ters have not been pleased, in consequence of the judgment of the last meeting of the commission of the General Assembly, to make any change in the composition of the said royal commission. And whereas that commission, from its authorising the commissioners to inquire generally into the opportunities of religious worship, the means of religious instruction, and the pastoral superintendence afforded to the people of Scotland, may be, and has been, interpreted as at variance with the principles and policy of the established church, and as calculated to weaken or to overthrow it, particularly in so far as it seems to involve in it a principle subversive of this and all other ecclesiastical establishments, viz., that whenever religious instruction and pastoral superintendence are found to a certain extent afforded by any sect or denomination whatever, there the services of an established church are not required, and may be dispensed with; the commission of the General Assembly publicly and solemnly protest against whatever has such a tendency, and declare that they consider it to be the sacred duty of the legislature to support and to protect the national church, and to secure accommodation and religious instruction to the people of Scotland, so that they may attend regularly upon divine ordinances, and may profit by the pastoral exertions and superintendence of its ministers. With a view to these most important objects, and under the protestation herein contained, they approve of such members of the church as may be required to do so by the commissioners nominated by his majesty, furnishing accurate information as to all statistical matters; and also approve of all church courts, allowing inspection of, or giving extracts from, their records, of all entries relating to the same matters; it being clearly understood that the commission of the Assembly hold, that it is not competent to the commissioners to put to individual members any questions relating to the doctrine, worship, government, or discipline of the church."

A select committee was appointed to inquire into the extent and tendency of the Orange societies.

On the 2nd of June Mr. Grote made his annual mo-

tion in favour of vote by ballot, by proposing a resolution, "That it is the opinion of this House that the votes at elections for members of parliament should be taken by way of secret ballot." The motion was supported on the same grounds which had been urged to the House on former occasions; but a new feature in the discussion consisted in the admission made by some of the friends of the ballot that a majority of the landed property, at least, of the country, was opposed to the ministry, and that the ballot was necessary and would be effectual to prevent the continued influence of that property from being exercised against them. Sir W. Molesworth, member for Cornwall (East), who seconded the motion, said, that ministers ought now to be aware of the fact, to them undoubtedly a most mortifying fact, that amongst the gentry of England their party was decidedly in the minority; they ought now to be aware that the great majority of the aristocracy, of the landed gentry, and all the clergy to a man, were their determined and irreconcilable foes, who would spare no efforts, who would use every species of intimidation and undue influence to compass their destruction. They could not, with the same weapons, successfully contend against their too powerful antagonists; if they could not protect their friends—and they were too weak to do so without the aid of the ballot—if they left their supporters exposed to the tender mercies of the Tory party, they would by degrees be ejected, like Lord John Russell, from the representation of all the counties of England. Did they remember their fatal losses in the counties during the last general election? Did they remember that their friends were ejected and replaced by their antagonists in Berkshire, Buckinghamshire, Cambridgeshire, Denbighshire, Derbyshire, Devonshire (South), Essex (South), Gloucestershire (West), Hampshire (South), Lancashire (South), Leicestershire (South), Lincolnshire, Norfolk (East), Suffolk (West), Surrey (East), Surrey (West), Warwickshire (South); that within the last few weeks they had been again dismissed from Devonshire, Inverness-shire, and Staffordshire? Was this list not a sufficient proof to them of the

absolute necessity of the ballot? Did they prefer to be utterly annihilated as a party in the House rather than have the ballot? If so, their fate was nigh at hand, and they would well merit it. In the same spirit, Mr. C. Bul-ler, member for Liskeard, in arguing that an election conducted by ballot would be attended with less popular excitement than at present, said, that he objected to having that excitement carried to any degree beyond that which was absolutely necessary; but, under existing circumstances, feeling, as the liberal party did, that the majority of those enjoying wealth, property, and influence was against them, it was essential that they should endeavour to excite a fervid feeling in the breasts of the multitude; and therefore it was that they were obliged *to resort to popular agitation*, to counterbalance the force that was marshalled against them. The original motion was negatived; 317 voted against it and only 144 for it. Various notices of motions were given for leave to bring in bills for preventing bribery and corruption, for reducing expenses at elections, for protecting electors against intimidation, for indemnifying witnesses giving evidence in case of bribery, &c. &c.; but the only legislative measure carried through was a bill altering the reform bill, in so far as it allowed two days for taking the votes at a contested election; and limited the poll to one day, unless it should be found necessary to adjourn it in consequence of riot.

An unsuccessful motion was made for the relief of the agricultural interests; discussions took place on that most perplexing subject, the currency, and a motion was made for a repeal of the window-tax. This last led to considerable discussion, in the course of which a general revision of our taxation was strongly and properly recommended.

Parliament was prorogued on the 10th of September, his majesty lamenting that the civil contest in the northern provinces of Spain had not yet been brought to a termination.

This year Donna Maria, queen of Portugal, achieved something new in politics. She dismissed and recalled a

ministry all in one day ! Unable to form a new administration, she was compelled to accept the services of her former advisers, with Saldanha at their head. In a week after Saldanha was a second time dismissed, and Marquis Loulé appointed prime-minister. The change was satisfactory to the mob and to the national guards, who now ruled the country. In Spain as well as in Portugal the ultra-liberals, the first of all bad politicians, seemed to be gaining the ascendancy ; from their former intolerant Catholicism both these countries were fast falling into irreligion and materialism, and were ready to prove, as their exemplars, the French Jacobins, had done before them, that Atheists can be as intolerant as bigoted Papists.

In France many attempts had been made to assassinate the king. If Louis Philippe had not worn a charmed life he must have perished long ago. The most terrible attempt against him was reserved for this year. On the 28th of July, during the festivities of the annual commemoration of the revolution of 1830, the French king narrowly escaped assassination. It was the second day of the rejoicings, and appointed for a military review. As Louis Philippe was riding along the line of the national guard, on the Boulevard du Temple, accompanied by his three sons and a splendid suite, an explosion like a discharge of musketry took place from the window of an adjoining house. The effect was terrific. Marshal Mortier, General de Virigny, several grenadiers, besides lookers-on, among whom was a child, were shot dead upon the spot, some of them having received two or three bullets. Upwards of forty were killed and wounded, of whom fourteen were killed ; yet the object of this indiscriminate slaughter escaped—the king was unhurt. The police, guided by the smoke, rushed into the house whence the explosion proceeded. They seized the assassin covered with blood, in the act of letting himself down by a rope from the back window of the apartment. He was himself severely wounded by the bursting of some of the barrels of his “infernal machine,” and his wounds had

delayed his escape. The machine consisted of twenty-five barrels, arranged horizontally side by side upon a frame, the back part of which could be raised or lowered according to the angle requisite to reach and sweep the space below. Each barrel was loaded with deadly missiles; the touch-holes communicated by means of a train of gunpowder, and the lighting of one simultaneously discharged them all. The window at a little distance from which the machine was placed stood open, but the machine itself had been screened from observation by Persian blinds, which were not withdrawn till the instant of explosion. It was conjectured that the time required to open the blinds had not been calculated, which omission saved the king, for the discharge took place immediately behind him, one of the bullets wounding his horse. The assassin turned out to be a Corsican named Fieschi, who had gone through many disreputable vicissitudes—had been a soldier—stood in the pillory for forgery—suffered two years' imprisonment for theft—and had been a spy of the police. He made no attempt to deny his guilt; he acknowledged no motive except dislike of the king. His trial showed that two persons as obscure as himself had been privy to his enterprise, but not the slightest thread of connexion could be traced between the desperado and any formidable conspiracy or political party. A momentary stupor followed the explosion; but as soon as it was known that neither the king nor the princes were hurt, it gave place to tumultuous expressions of joy, mingled with rage against the author of the crime. The forms of the review were gone through by the king, but the rejoicings of the revolutionary anniversary were suspended; the tri-coloured flag was veiled in crape; the victims of the massacre were buried with the honours of a public funeral, which the king and his family attended; and pensions were voted by the chambers to the poor persons who had been wounded and the relatives of those who had been killed.

A.D. 1836.—Parliament was opened by the king in person on the 4th of February. The speech expressed regret at the continuance of the civil war in Spain, and

a hope that our mediation between France and the United States of America would be attended with success. The quarrel which had arisen between those two governments was entirely a money-quarrel. The Americans, who had submitted to be robbed by Bonaparte, had been clamouring for restitution and indemnity ever since the restoration of the Bourbons: the French had been very slow in recognising the justice of their claims; and, after acknowledging them, had been still slower in paying. There had been a terrible blustering on the other side of the Atlantic, with threats of going to war for the recovery of the money. Our mediation did in the end prove successful. The king's speech affirmed that the state of commerce and manufactures was highly satisfactory, but that difficulties continued to press on agriculture. Attention was directed to measures that would be submitted for increasing the efficiency of the church, for the commutation of tithes, and for alleviating the grievances of dissenters. The necessity of maintaining the maritime strength, and of giving adequate protection to commerce, had occasioned an increase in the naval estimates. Improvements in the administration of justice were recommended, especially in the Court of Chancery; a just settlement of tithes in Ireland; a remedy to defects in the municipal corporations of Ireland, founded on the same principles as the municipal acts passed for England and Scotland. Finally, the condition of the poor of Ireland was alluded to, and an intimation thrown out that the experience afforded of the "salutary effect" of the Poor Law Amendment Act in England might guide them in their approaches to this difficult subject. In both Houses amendments were moved to the ministerial address, by the Duke of Wellington and Sir R. Peel, with a view of avoiding a specific pledge to reform the corporations of Ireland on the same principles as those of Britain. In the Upper House, where opposition by ministers would have been unavailing, the amendment was agreed to without a division. In the Commons the House divided, when the original address was carried by 284 against 243.

The paragraph relating to agricultural distress in the king's speech having been read, Lord John Russell moved for a select committee to inquire into the causes of the depression of that interest. His lordship, however, confessed that he did not anticipate any satisfactory result from the investigation. It appears that the principal problem to be solved was, why the price of wheat was at present so much lower than it used to be, in relation to the price of barley; but, if this be an evil, it was one that was likely to puzzle parliament to cure. The landed interest was left to solve the difficulty in their own way, for the proportion of country to town members in the committee was nearly four to one. The committee sat four months, but was unable to agree to a report, and merely laid before the House the evidence they had taken.

On the 9th of February Lord John Russell brought forward the cabinet plan for the commutation of tithes in England. It was easily carried, and became an act. By this act, which extends to Wales, provision was made for the final extinction, within two years, of the right of exacting tithes in kind, and for commuting them into a corn-rent-charge, payable in money according to the value of a fixed quantity of corn, as yearly ascertained by the average of the preceding seven years. If the parties could not agree among themselves upon a permanent commutation before October 1st, 1838, commissioners were to proceed to make an award, which should be binding for ever after.

On the 12th of February Lord John Russell submitted to the Commons two measures of great importance: the first being a bill for a general registration of marriages, births, and deaths; the second a bill for the amendment of the marriage-laws. They both became statutes. By the second of them dissenters were allowed to be married in their own chapels, meeting-houses, or conventicles, or wherever else they might think fit, instead of being forced, as heretofore, to comply with the rites of the established church; or any person that chose might be lawfully married without any religious ceremony at all,

or any other form except that of making a declaration of the act before a public officer. The dissenters, who had clamoured for this boon, seemed in very many cases to be averse to it when it was conceded.

On the 8th of July Lord John Russell explained the ministerial plan for the reform of the English church. It was founded on four reports made by the ecclesiastical commissioners. In its full scope it went to a new arrangement of dioceses and their revenues; to the creation of two new bishoprics; to the appropriation of the redundant revenues of the deans and chapters; to the improvement of poor livings, and to the diminution of non-residence and pluralities. Only one of the four bills intended was brought forward, namely, that respecting the sees. The House seems to have been taken by surprise, and the bill was read a second time without opposition or special notice. At this stage the Radicals evinced such a determined hostility to the ministers' scheme of church-reform, that they were only able to carry the Established Church Bill during the short remainder of the session. By this bill the bishopric of Bristol was to be united to that of Gloucester; that of St. Asaph to that of Bangor; and that of Sodor and Man to that of Chester; and two new bishoprics were to be erected, one at Manchester and the other at Ripon. The income of the Archbishop of Canterbury was to be reduced to 15,000*l.*; that of the Archbishop of York to 10,000*l.*; that of the Bishop of London to 10,000*l.*; that of the Bishop of Durham to 8000*l.*; that of the Bishop of Winchester to 7000*l.*; that of the Bishop of Ely to 5500*l.*; that of the Bishop of St. Asaph and Bangor to 5200*l.*; and that of the Bishop of Worcester to 5000*l.* These reductions amount altogether to a sum of about 28,500*l.* per annum. The other bishops were to have incomes ranging from 4000*l.* to 5000*l.* No ecclesiastical dignity or benefice was to be in future granted to any bishop to be held *in commendam*. These regulations, it was expected, would lessen translations, by leaving only three or four sees objects of temptation. Acts were also passed for separating the palatine juris-

diction of the Archbishop of York and the Bishop of Ely in certain districts, and for imposing restrictions on the renewal of ecclesiastical leases. Finally, on the abandonment of the other church bills relative to residence and pluralities, and a new appropriation of the revenues of cathedral and collegiate churches, a bill was introduced for suspending for one year appointments to dignities in those establishments, and to sinecure rectories.

For some time a war had been vigorously carried on against the newspaper-stamp tax. On the 15th of March Mr. Spring Rice, as chancellor of the exchequer, stated that it was the intention of government to revise the whole of the law respecting stamp-duties; first, by consolidating into one statute the 150 acts of parliament over which the law was at present distributed; secondly, by the apportionment of the various rates on a new principle—namely, by the simple and uniform rule of making the price of the stamp in every case correspond to the pecuniary value involved in the transaction for which it is required. The effect of this change would be to reduce the stamp-duty upon indentures of apprenticeship, bills of lading, and many others of the more common instruments, and to increase it somewhat upon mortgages and conveyances of large amounts of property; but it was not expected that it would make much difference upon the entire produce of the duties. The Consolidation Act which was in preparation, it was intimated, would contain no fewer than 330 sections; but it was suggested by some members that it might probably be a more convenient plan to divide all this matter into a short series of acts, one for each class of stamp-duties. With regard to the stamp on newspapers, Mr. Rice stated that it was proposed to reduce it from its present amount of 4*d.* with the discount, to 1*d.* without discount. This would be a reduction of exactly 2½*d.* on all newspapers sold for 7*d.* or less, and of rather more than 2½*d.* on all sold for more than 7*d.* A portion varying between two-thirds and three-fourths of the whole tax would thus be remitted. To this remission

parliament assented ; by which the illicit circulation of unstamped newspapers, which had long been followed, was at once rendered so profitless as to be entirely abandoned. Some members were opposed to the retention of the penny stamp, considering it the duty of government to remove every obstacle to the diffusion of political information. But this would have made a postage necessary, to which the newspaper-proprietors were opposed as practically inconvenient ; and which, moreover, would have been virtually a tax on the country reader of a London newspaper, from which the town reader would have been exempt. The transmission of papers at the public expense, without either stamp or postage, appeared an inadmissible proposition. It would have evinced a desire to spread political intelligence to the exclusion of literature and science. Some were in favour of the repeal of the duties on paper in lieu of the stamp-duty on newspapers. The reduction of the newspaper-tax was the only proposition of Mr. Rice on the stamp-duties that was carried.

Shortly after this the chancellor of the exchequer, after stating that the income for the year would exceed the expenditure by 662,000*l.*, reduced the duty on first class paper, and altogether abolished the duty on stained paper ; he remitted the South-sea duties, and proposed the reduction of the duties on insurances of farming-stock, taxed carts, &c.

The Lords went into committee on the Irish Municipal Bill, when an amendment, moved by Lord Lyndhurst on the second clause, which went to raise the whole question between the plan of the reform of the corporations as proposed by ministers, and that simply of abolition brought forward by the opposition, was finally carried on a division by 107 against 15. All the rest of the clauses of the bill to the 21st inclusive were then struck out on the motion of the said noble lord, except the 3rd and the 10th, which were agreed to.

On the 1st of June, on the second reading of the Irish Tithe Bill, Lord Stanley moved an amendment, the object of which was to get rid of the appropriation

clause, and preserve to the church undiminished its revenues. The discussion lasted three nights, during which all the leading members on both sides addressed the House. Lord Stanley intimated that the adoption of his amendment would obtain for the ministerial bill the support of those whose co-operation never could nor would be otherwise obtained. Lord John Russell in reply contended that, in legislating for Ireland, it was necessary to consult the interest and feelings of the great body of the people. The real question in controversy, both in regard to the church and corporations, in the future government of Ireland, was, whether the old Protestant ascendancy or the national interests should be consulted. On the other hand, it was urged by a third class of reasoners, that the ministers' bill was weak, and remote from a final settlement. If, for example, according to their own position, the church of Ireland were in future to be regulated according to the prevailing taste of a majority of its inhabitants, the mere abstraction, as proposed, of 90,000*l.* from its present revenues, would not attain that object. The debate was very long; but on a division, Lord Stanley's amendment was rejected by 300 against 261. Lord John Russell's bill was then read a second time. In the Lords great alterations were made in the bill; the Commons refused to concur in their lordships' amendments, and in the end the bill was let drop. Precisely the same fate befell the Irish Corporations Reform Bill.

Loud complaints had already been raised against the New Poor Law Statutes, and still more against the harshness with which the government functionaries had administered those laws. On the 1st of August Mr. Walter moved for a select committee to inquire into the operation of the New Poor Law, particularly in regard to out-door relief and the separation of husbands from wives, and children from their parents. Lord John Russell, recurring to arithmetical figures and not to the domestic affections, affirmed that the country was saving nearly 2,000,000*l.* per annum by the present mode of treating the poor. This was considered so very satis-

factory that the House rejected Mr. Walter's motion by a majority of nearly two to one.

For a considerable number of years the public had obtained admission to the Houses of Parliament only by written orders of peers of the Upper House, and for the Commons by the Speaker's order to a seat below the gallery, and either by a member's order, or by the payment of 2s. 6d., to the gallery. But it was now regulated that admission to the Commons' gallery by paying the 2s. 6d. should be abolished, and that the written order of a member should be made the only passport. This was certainly not a change for the better. It has had the effect of restricting the number of those who frequented the Commons' gallery, and it is constantly felt as an inconvenience.

On the 20th of August, while Mr. Hume was in the middle of a vituperative speech directed against the House of Lords, the usher of the black rod summoned the Commons to the Upper House to hear the prorogation speech. His majesty congratulated parliament and the country on the flourishing state of commerce and manufactures.

For some time a considerable body of British troops, called the Spanish Legion, in the pay of Spain, and under the command of Colonel Evans, had been fighting for the young Queen Isabella against the Carlists in the Basque Provinces. It cannot be said that they or their gallant commander had much raised the military reputation of our country, or that they had done much good for the cause which they were supporting. The gallant colonel either proved that he was no strategist, or that his men and the Spaniards co-operating with them were incapable of executing combined movements, or any difficult evolution or movement whatsoever. The minds of these Englishmen became familiarized with scenes of horror and Spanish cruelty. Lord John Hay, commander of the British naval squadron stationed off the Basque Provinces on the northern coast of Spain, received orders from the British government to co-operate with Queen Isabella's army and the auxiliary forces of Evans. In the

month of May his lordship rendered very important services, by sending in two armed steamers, which, by a well-directed fire, opened a passage through the Carlist fortified works near Hernani. Evans's Legion carried those works, but not until they had lost in killed and wounded from 70 to 80 officers and nearly 800 men. The Carlist general was killed in the action. At other points Lord John Hay's squadron rendered efficient aid, discouraging the brave Basques far more than any other force or any other circumstance could have done. These men were perpetually declaring, that, if England would keep her ships of war neutral, and recall Evans and his Legion, they could easily maintain their Provinces, and the liberties which they had so long enjoyed in them, against their Spanish enemies. The Spanish constitutionalists were broken up into desperate factions, and there was an almost total want of morality and common honesty among the functionaries of their government. The most atrocious cruelties were being perpetrated all over the kingdom. At Barcelona the populace massacred all the Carlist prisoners, and then shouted for the constitution of 1812. At Tortosa, General Nogueras, who commanded the queen's troops, ordered the governor to seize the aged mother of the Carlist partisan Cabrera, and to put her to death in retaliation for the cruel deeds of her son. The governor refused to comply with this monstrous command, on which General Nogueras applied to General Mina, who, having entirely failed in the Basque Provinces, was now captain-general of Catalonia. Mina directed that the orders should be immediately executed, and the very old and infirm woman was actually shot in one of the public places of Tortosa. Mina did not long survive this detestable act: he died in his bed, leaving a name which had once been honoured covered with everlasting infamy. Cabrera took vengeance into his own hands. He issued a sort of proclamation, ordering his troops to put to death every prisoner they made; and he began his reprisals by shooting the wives of four constitutional officers. Other victims were soon added to this list, Cabrera declaring that thirty at least must fall to expiate the murder of his mother.

The government was deplorably weak, and hurried on its destruction by an attempt to appear strong. Being left in a minority, ministers dissolved the Cortes. At Malaga, Cadiz, Seville, and Cordova, the constitution of 1812 was proclaimed, and provincial juntas were established, wholly independent of the queen's authority. On the 3rd, a movement commenced in Madrid; but it was put down, and the capital declared in a state of siege. But on the 12th the insurrection became more serious, and a regiment of provincial militia doing duty at St. Ildefonso demanded the constitution of 1812. They forced themselves into the apartment of the queen-regent in spite of the remonstrances of the French and English ambassadors, and obtained from her a promise of the acceptance of the constitution. This produced a revolution in the metropolis. Isturitz, the prime minister, made his escape, reached Lisbon, and from thence proceeded to England. General Quesada, the military governor of Madrid, was not so fortunate, being taken by the populace about three miles from the capital, and savagely put to death. Ultimately, the constitution was proclaimed by the queen-regent, subject to the revision of the Cortes, and a new ministry of decided liberals was formed. The new government commenced with vigour. A forced loan to the amount of 2,000,000*l.* was sought to be raised; a conscription of 50,000 was called for to send against the Carlists; the property of emigrant Carlists was confiscated; and the example of France and Portugal was proposed to be followed, by the extinction of the remaining moiety of tithe, leaving the clergy stipendiaries of the state, or dependent on voluntary contributions. Early in the ensuing year some modifications in the constitution of 1812 were proposed and adopted by the Cortes. It was, however, impossible to make anything good out of a constitution so fundamentally and so thoroughly bad. The new ministry, who were indebted for their possession of office to an insurgent serjeant of the guards, soon tottered on their seats, and felt how much more easy it is to go along with a fierce democracy than to check or control it. It was made visible that no government could be made permanent in Spain.

A fearful waste was made of the church and monastic property. In the remote country districts, where there were no inns, the reign of hospitality was over. It ended with the suppression of the monasteries, at whose gates the wayfarer, let his religion be what it might, had never applied in vain. A revolution in Spain was usually a prelude to a revolution in Portugal. At Lisbon serious disagreements had arisen between the court and the assembled Cortes, on account of the appointment of the young queen's husband to the command-in-chief of the army. The Cortes were about voting an address against the army being under the command of a foreigner, when they were abruptly dissolved by the queen. Then came news of the revolution of Madrid. The political clubs put themselves in motion, and an insurrection was speedily organized. On the 9th of September, a motley band of troops of the line, caçadores, volunteers, and national guards, proclaimed the constitution adopted by John VI. Donna Maria would have resisted; but the non-commissioned officers of the regular troops, exercising the chief authority, as in Spain, refused to march, and joined the insurgents in calling for a change of government. The Duke of Terceira, Cavalho, and other individuals, took refuge from the popular fury on board the English squadron in the Tagus; and a new ministry was set up, to be speedily knocked down again. The Portuguese peers addressed a formal protest to the queen against this revolution. The Duke of Palmella, the first in influence as in ability, headed the protest. The provinces expressed by deputations their approval of the proceedings in the capital.

Switzerland, which had never been quiet since the Paris revolution of 1830, was now involved in a serious quarrel with France, and was jealously and anxiously watched by the troops of Baden, Wurtemberg, Bavaria, Piedmont, and all the contiguous states. M. Thiers threatened the Swiss with an "hermetic blockade." The Swiss replied, that all the troubles of their country, and all the political conspiracies which France complained of, had been hatched by an agent of the French ambas-

sador. This charge was founded on the confession of the spy himself, who had been arrested while going about Switzerland with a passport signed by the French ambassador's chief secretary. The British government offered its mediation, and the quarrel was made up before the end of the year.

In France another shot was fired at Louis Philippe as he was passing to open the chambers.

A.D. 1837.—Parliament was opened by commission on the 31st of January. The speech from the throne was not gloomy, although the aspect of affairs was far from being cheerful. A mania for speculation and over-trading had created great commercial embarrassments, and there had been one of those money-panics which periodically visit the country. His majesty's speech recommended a renewal of the inquiry into the operation of joint-stock banks, which had contributed to create the existing disorder.

On the 13th of February, Lord John Russell detailed, in a committee of the whole House, the government plan for introducing Poor-Laws into Ireland. It was favourably received by the House, though strenuously opposed by Mr. O'Connell. The progress of the bill was interrupted by the dissolution of Parliament.

Mr. Walter again moved for a committee to inquire into the operation of the Poor Law Act. An amendment was proposed by Lord John Russell for a committee to inquire into the administration of the relief of the poor, under the orders and regulations of the Poor Law Commissioners. This was carried, and a committee, having power for a full inquiry, short of calling in question the principle of the bill, was agreed to.

Ministers found themselves compelled to abandon their Bill for the Abolition of Church Rates. They entertained the project of appointing a committee to inquire into the mode of leasing and managing the real estates of the church.

On the vote for the navy estimates, Lord Mahon called the attention of the House to the wretched state of Spain, and to the manner in which British forces had

been employed in a civil war. Lord Palmerston defended the course of policy adopted by the present government. His lordship maintained that an interference would put an end to the civil war, and so carry into effect the Quadripartite Treaty of 1834. Sir Robert Peel in the Commons and the Duke of Wellington in the Lords censured the whole of this policy. The duke had never approved of the treaty. He thought that there should be no intervention in the internal affairs of Spain. Indeed the notion of forcing any system of government in Spain was impracticable: to do so we must take into pay, not only our own army, but the Spanish—a proposition which he suspected would not be very palatable to a House of Commons, or a Chamber of Deputies. He deprecated, therefore, any such attempt as absurd and ruinous to ourselves, and still more so for the sake of Spain herself. He could say, to his certain knowledge, that three several parties had already been ruined in Spain by our intervention. Individuals had been induced to take a certain line of action by the assurances of our government: they had afterwards, of necessity, been abandoned by their own, and were so left with their families ruined, their properties sacrificed, and their prospects blighted for ever.

Prior to the Easter recess Lord John Russell obtained leave to introduce a series of bills for the further amendment of the criminal law. These were eventually passed into statutes. They were to a great extent a realization of the humane views which Sir Samuel Romilly had so ably and so earnestly advocated a quarter of a century before this period. They removed the extreme penalty of the law from all offences except seven of the most heinous kind. Lord Morpeth brought forward a resolution for the settlement of the Irish tithe question; but the measure had no better success than in the preceding session. The Conservative party had greatly gained in parliamentary strength, and the Whigs in a good many cases could not depend upon their Radical allies, although to them they had owed the possession of office.

On Lord Melbourne moving that the House go into

committee on the Irish Municipal Bill, the Duke of Wellington said that the bill had a direct tendency to injure the Protestant church establishment in Ireland, which, for three hundred years, it had been the policy of England to uphold; and that, as there were several other measures pendent in the House of Commons which affected the interests of the church, their lordships ought to wait till they had all the bills together. His grace therefore moved to postpone the bill to the 9th of June; and this was carried by 192 against 115. On June the 9th, Lord Lyndhurst moved a farther postponement to the 3rd of July.

On the 20th of June his majesty William IV. expired in Windsor Castle. He had expressed a wish to survive the anniversary of the battle of Waterloo on the 18th, and so far he had been gratified. He was in the 73rd year of his age, and, in a few days, would have completed the seventh year of his reign. By his death, and consequent accession to the throne of his niece the Princess Victoria, the crowns of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland and of Hanover became dissevered, as the operation of the Salique law excluded females in Hanover. The throne of that country therefore devolved to the Duke of Cumberland, the next heir-male. By parliamentary provision made in 1831, Adelaide, now queen-dowager, had 100,000*l.* per annum for her natural life, with Marlborough House and Bushey Park for residences.

QUEEN VICTORIA.

A.D. 1837.—The accession of a young and interesting female was, in an eminent degree, favourable to royalty in this country. Even rabid radicalism was for a moment soothed into tranquillity. In her first address to the council the young queen gracefully said—"Educated in England under the tender and enlightened care of a most affectionate mother, I have learned from my infancy to respect and love the constitution of my native country.

"It will be my unceasing study to maintain the reformed religion as by law established; securing at the same time to all the full enjoyment of religious liberty. And I shall steadily protect the rights, and promote to the utmost of my power, the happiness and welfare of all classes of my subjects."

Fortunately the money panic was over, and the country was tranquil. The popularity of the Whig ministers was declining, and there was a rumour that the young queen would dismiss them. But she retained all those she found in place. They ostentatiously proclaimed that the queen entered warmly into their views, and had espoused their political creed without reservation. After the necessary dissolution of parliament, the ministerial candidates traversed the country placarded as it were with her majesty's name, and inviting the electors to show their loyalty by supporting her majesty's ministers. Lord John Russell, as well as the other ministers, took especial care to identify the queen with the cabinet, and to convince the country that the young sovereign was so thoroughly enamoured of Whig principles and of the Whigs personally, that it would be impossible for her ever to tolerate Tories or Conservatives. Yet it can scarcely be said that ministers gained ground at the elec-

tions. The demonstration of public opinion was still less in favour of the Radicals. Bath, Liverpool, and Hull rejected their late Radical members and returned Conservatives. In the city of London, Mr. Grote, once the favourite member, found himself in a bare majority of 6 over the Conservative candidate, Mr. Horsley Palmer. Mr. Hume was unseated in Middlesex, and driven to the necessity of appearing in the House of Commons as Daniel O'Connell's nominee for the city of Kilkenny. Generally the Whigs lost the county elections; yet Sir James Graham, the Conservative candidate, was rejected by East Cumberland. Some new joints were added to the O'Connell Tail.

The loyalty of England did not reach to Lower Canada. The French or French-descended portion of the inhabitants of that province had long been in a very turbulent state; and the beginning of the reign of a youthful female sovereign seemed to these people a very proper period for driving on to the extremities of democracy, agitation, insurrection, and civil war. The subject engaged the attention of parliament, and vexed and perplexed ministers. Mistakes were committed in the cabinet, and the hands of the resident Governors of Canada were tied up.

A.D. 1838.—Parliament re-assembled on the 16th of January. Lord John Russell met the Commons with a proposal for a bill to suspend for a certain time the existing constitution of Lower Canada. At the same time he moved an address to the throne, pledging the House to assist her majesty in restoring tranquillity to her Canadian dominions. After a recapitulation of the principal events that had occurred since the first connexion of the colony with Great Britain down to the report of the committee of 1828, he took up his ground on that report which the Assembly of Lower Canada had themselves characterized as “an imperishable monument of the justice and profound wisdom of the committee—an authentic testimonial of the reality of their grievances, and of the justice of their complaints faithfully interpreting their wishes and their wants.” “Now it might have

been supposed," said his lordship, "that after the people and the government of this country had proved themselves anxious to perform, aye, more than perform all that was asked for, and that was indicated by the report of the committee, some satisfaction would have been produced in the minds of the Canadians, and some expression of cordiality towards the British government might have been elicited. But the reverse was the case. On the 6th of December, 1828, the House of Assembly had resolved, That on the permanent settlement before-mentioned being effected, it would be expedient to render the governor, lieutenant-governor, or person administering the government for the time being, the judges and executive councillors, independent of the annual vote of that House, to the extent of their present salaries."

That amongst the questions not particularly mentioned on that occasion, that House held, as most essential to the peace, welfare, and good government of the province, the independence of the judges, and their removal from the political business of the colony; the responsibility and accountability of public officers; a greater independence of support from the public revenues, and more intimate connexion with the interests of the colony in the composition of the legislative council; the application of the late property of the Jesuits to the purposes of general education; a removal of the inconvenience attendant upon the crown and clergy reserves; and a diligent inquiry into, and a ready redress of, all grievances and abuses that may be found to exist, or which may have been petitioned against by the subjects in the province.

Lord John Russell proceeded to state what had been done in order to remedy the particular grievances complained of. With respect to the independence of the judges, Lord Ripon (then colonial secretary) had fully concurred in the reasonableness of the proposal, and had himself suggested a method for carrying it into effect. But the House of Assembly, instead of following out that suggestion, tacked to the law by which the inde-

pendence of the judges was to be secured, certain provisions relating to the hereditary revenues of the crown, and to the establishment of a court of impeachment for the judges. Now the independence of the judges was simply and of itself a positive good, and the annexation of perplexing conditions was a pretty good proof that it was not their wish to rid themselves of the grievance complained of. With respect to the accountability of public officers, Lord Ripon had also proposed a measure which the House of Assembly would not allow to pass, though it was planned with a view to secure the most beneficial results.

As regarded the subject on which the widest difference between the assembly and the imperial government had existed, no opposition had been offered. The judges had been forthwith informed, that, with the exception of the chief justice, it was no longer desirable that they should sit in the legislative council; and a number of persons, for the most part of French extraction, were added to that body, totally independent of the crown, and giving a great majority in the council to those who were unconnected with the government. The assembly might indeed say, that they were none of them persons agreeable to their wishes, or acquainted with their wants, but the question was, whether they were not independent of office, and closely connected with the interests of the colony. Of the 40 members of the council, not less than eighteen were French Canadians; many of the members of English origin had quitted the province, and but seven remained in official connexion with the government. As to the property of the Jesuits, it had actually been ordered to be applied to educational purposes, and the only grievance connected with that point now remaining was, that the estates had been leased to persons other than those whom the assembly desired to see in possession of them.

Another question related to the crown and clergy reserves. Lord Ripon had declared his readiness to put an end to the old system, and only differed from the assembly in wishing to prevent an undue facility from

being afforded to poor and improvident purchasers of the waste lands.

The next grievance arose out of the much-contested question of the duties collected under the earlier acts, and which the crown had, according to law, the right of appropriating. The Committee of 1828 had been of opinion, that these duties should be submitted to the appropriation of the assembly; but they recommended that this measure should be accompanied by a permanent settlement for the salaries of the judges and other functionaries. Government however had, in 1831, carried a bill through the imperial parliament which entirely repealed the power of appropriation by this country, and left it to the assembly without condition, without stipulation, to dispose altogether of those duties.

The Canadians made but a poor return for these concessions. In the year 1833 the House of Assembly tacked to a supply bill some very unusual conditions, providing that the persons holding certain offices should not be allowed salaries, unless they relinquished other offices. This strange bill was rejected by the governor. In 1834 the same House of Assembly adopted a new course which had led directly to the present difficulties. It passed 92 resolutions, some of grievance, some of eulogy, some of vituperation, and amounting in the whole to a vehement remonstrance against government; and, after spending an entire session in framing this remonstrance, it separated without passing any supply-bill whatever. At this period the more able and more respectable of the party in opposition detached themselves from their former associates, for they saw that their policy was violent and aggressive, and that they were aiming not at reform, but at convulsion and revolution. Yet were there some Englishmen who continued to adhere to the French Canadian Radical faction, and went with that faction to such a length as would, under a less lenient government, have brought them to the foot of the scaffold. Since 1834 no supplies had been voted. During the very short administration of Sir Robert Peel, Lord Amherst had been sent out, not merely as governor, but also as com-

missioner, to investigate and redress grievances. That appointment had been made null by the dissolution of Sir Robert's Administration. Returning to office, the Whigs dispatched Lord Gosford to fill the place of Lord Amherst. The new governor and commissioner could not alter the temper of the House of Assembly. The supplies continued to be refused. Lord John Russell stated the strong objections which he felt to an elective legislative council which could represent only the passions and violence already existing in the assembly. The evils, he said, which would attend the responsibility of the executive council to the assembly alone was still greater, and would at once derange the relation in which a colony ought always to stand towards the imperial government. Lord John then proceeded to give an outline of an intended bill, and to state what sort of person, in his opinion, ought to be sent out to Canada, in order to carry the bill into effect. "I think," said he, "it is most important that the person to be sent from this country should be one whose conduct and character should be beyond exception; a person not conversant solely with matters of administration, but with the more important affairs which are brought before parliament. I think he should also be conversant with the affairs of the various states of Europe; and moreover that it should be implied by his nomination, that we were not opposed to opinions the most liberal, and that we were favourable to popular feelings and popular rights. Having said thus much, I know not why I should refrain from adding, that her majesty has been pleased to intrust the conduct of this affair to one whom her advisers think in every respect fitted for the charge, namely, the Earl of Durham; and that noble lord, having accepted the office, will proceed, in due time, to perform its important duties."

The Earl of Durham, son-in-law of Earl Grey, was one whose Whiggism bordered on Radicalism. There could be little doubt that in the way of concession to popular outcry he would go to great lengths; but it was very generally considered that other considerations than

his fitness for the office of conciliator weighed with ministers in giving him the appointment. His lordship did not include among his merits the capital one of a good temper: his disagreements, his altercations with various of the members of the Whig government, were matter of notoriety: he was too powerful to be thrown off—he must be conciliated, but kept at a distance. He reluctantly accepted what was offered to him, and proceeded to Canada with a somewhat suspiciously Radical staff.

Lord John Russell concluded his long discourse by declaring that although, in his opinion, a time might arrive when he would not be indisposed to give the 1,400,000 of our present fellow-subjects living in Canada a participation in the perfect freedom enjoyed by the mother-country, he thought that the day for separation was still at a distance.

Sir Robert Peel protested against the doctrine that the manifestation of a rebellious spirit on the part of a colony was reason sufficient for releasing it from its allegiance. He argued that this principle, if applicable at all, must be universally so, and no less at the service of the Isle of Wight than of Canada. He promised his cordial consent to the address, because, in his opinion, this country had acted with justice and liberality towards Canada: he had never known an instance in which a mother-country had manifested a greater desire to do justice to her dependancy. But in supporting the address he begged that he might not be understood to place confidence in ministers, or to be satisfied with their past conduct. Measures of precaution had been neglected. The military force in the colony ought to have been increased last year. Mr. Hume, with Mr. Roebuck, had been one of the loudest performers on the trumpet of revolt and insurrection. Sir Robert Peel did not forget the fact. He agreed, he said, with the observation Mr. Hume had just made in the House, that the blame rested with those who had drawn an innocent and harmless people into a hopeless insurrection; and then he reminded the ex-member for Middlesex and

present member for Kilkenny of an inflammatory letter which in the year 1834 he (Mr. Hume) had addressed to Mr. Mackenzie in Upper Canada, and which contained the following passage:—"Your triumphant election of the 16th, and your rejection from the Assembly of the 17th, must hasten that crisis which is fast approaching in the affairs of the Canadas, and which will terminate in independence and freedom from the baneful domination of the mother-country, and the tyrannical conduct of a small and despicable faction. The proceedings between 1772 and 1782 in America ought never to be forgotten; and, to the honour of the Americans, and for the interest of the civilized world, let their conduct and the result be ever in view!" "Surely," continued Sir Robert, "Mr. Mackenzie, who has dragged the people into insurrection, may say, 'I acted on the authority of the honourable member for Kilkenny; visit not therefore this delusion and its consequences upon me!'"

An amendment to the address was rejected by 188 against 28. On the following day the new bill was presented to the House of Commons by Lord John Russell. The leading object of it, as stated by him, was to enable the governor-general and council (that council not to be limited in number, but of which five might be a quorum), on the motion of the governor, to pass any laws which might be considered necessary during the present suspension of the legislature of the province. In addition to these means for suppressing the insurrection, the governor-general would be authorised to grant a general amnesty. The powers conferred by the bill were to be vested in Sir John Colborne till the arrival of Lord Durham. With respect to the future government of the province, it was the intention of ministers that the governor-general should be invested with power to convene a certain number of persons—namely, three from the legislative councils of each of the two provinces, and ten "representatives" from each—to form a council to concert with the governor-general as to the measures which might be deemed advisable for the adjustment of

the affairs of the two provinces. This was a power that might be given by the prerogative of the crown alone. The persons to be named from the legislative councils would be chosen by the governor-general ; while those “ who were to be convened having a representative character ” might of course be taken from the Legislative Assembly ; but as in Lower Canada it was almost impossible that the Assembly could be brought to act beneficially, it would be competent to the governor-general, both in the upper and lower province, to hold elections for persons, amounting to twenty in the whole, to concert with him upon the general state of affairs.

In the House of Lords there had been some preliminary skirmishing about Canadian affairs. The Duke of Wellington, after expressing his hope that ministers would call upon parliament for the means of bringing the mad contest to a certain and speedy conclusion, let drop one of his concise and not-to-be-forgotten oracles—“ A great country like England can have no such thing as a little war.” Lord Glenelg moved an appropriate address to the queen. His lordship considered that the main cause of the disturbances which prevailed in Lower Canada might be found in the division of the two races which inhabited the province—a division which circumstances had not mellowed, but embittered. The numerical French, or French-descended majority, returned a preponderating proportion of the members of the House of Assembly. The consequence was that the predominant race excluded the other. It might be fairly said that the entire Assembly, thus composed, were attached to the obsolete notions of former times. They were unfriendly to commerce and to education, and were therefore opposed to the prevailing characteristics of the English race. The leaders of that body acted with little responsibility to their constituents, who, though an amiable and virtuous race, were yet very ignorant, and little fitted to appreciate the blessings bestowed upon them by the free constitution which England had conferred on the colonies. Their leaders had the advantage of fighting for obsolete notions with the weapons of popular insti-

tutions; while those who were favourable to real improvement, and combined wealth with intelligence, were compelled to resort to the aristocratic party, and were driven to the use of weapons which did not suit them.

Lord Brougham accused ministers of weakness and vacillation, and delivered a speech which, in many points of oratory, has never been surpassed. He called attention to the position of Lord Gosford, sent to the advanced posts of our empire, without instructions, unprovided with any but the ordinary force of the colony, to meet a crisis brought on by his employers! His lordship directed the most glowing invective against the ministerial policy which had provoked the Canadians, and yet adopted no step by way of precaution against the inevitable effect of the outrage offered. He exclaimed—"Tyranny and oppression have here appeared stripped of their instinctive apprehension, and habitual circumspection. Compared with the conduct which we are now called on to contemplate, the most vacillating and imbecile, the most inconsistent and impotent rulers rise into some station commanding respect—King John, and Richard Cromwell himself, become wise, politic, and vigorous princes."

The address was agreed to.

In the Commons the Canada Bill was subjected to some important amendments, and it was eventually carried through that House by immense majorities on the 29th of January. It was coercive and severe enough. After coquetting with insurrection, ministers now seemed determined to show no mercy to the insurgents. In the Upper House the Duke of Wellington dwelt on the hardship to Upper Canada of bringing that tranquil and well-affected province within the operations of the Bill. On the 8th of February the bill came on to be read for the third time. It was opposed by Lord Ellenborough, Lord Brougham, and Lord Fitzwilliam. Lord Ashburton animadverted on the rapid and seemingly capricious manner in which the Governors succeeded each other in the Canadas. Sir John Colborne had been removed to make way for Sir Francis Head; Sir Francis Head for Sir George Arthur; and now Sir George

Arthur must retire before the supreme authority of Lord Durham.

Lord Mansfield said that he believed a great portion of her majesty's subjects of large landed and other property, and of extensive influence, did feel there was a kind of incapacity in the present ministers from which they anxiously desired to be delivered. He regretted that the Duke of Wellington and Sir Robert Peel did not take more active measures of opposition.

The third reading was carried, and the royal assent was given to the bill. Its most important provisions were in substance as follow :—'The constitution of Lower Canada was suspended till November, 1840. Her majesty in council was empowered to constitute a special council, and to appoint or authorise the governor to appoint such and so many special councillors as she might think proper. It was declared that until November, 1840, it should be lawful for the governor, with the consent and advice of the majority of the said councillors convened for the purpose, to make such laws or ordinances for the peace, welfare, and good government of Lower Canada as the legislature of that province, at the time of passing the act, was empowered to make; and that all laws or ordinances so made, subject to the provisions thereafter contained for disallowance thereof by her majesty, should have the like force and effect as laws passed before the passing of the act by the legislative bodies. The governor was to have the initiative of all measures proposed to the council, five of whom were required for a quorum.

Then followed certain restrictive provisos before noticed.

It was then directed that a copy of every such law or ordinance be transmitted to the home government, and her majesty was empowered by an order in council at any time within two years from the receipt thereof, to disallow the same.

Irish affairs, or rather Irish orations, again occupied a disproportionate time in parliament. The Hibernian violence infected other members. On the 6th of

December the House of Commons was turned into a bear-garden. On the following evening Mr. Abercromby, the Speaker—the most impartial, moderate, and best man that had held that post for many a long year—after commenting in a tone of temperate rebuke on the insubordination of the House, solemnly declared that he would resign if such disgraceful scenes were repeated.

Mr. O'Connell, after a fearful tirade of abuse, charged some Tory committees of the House with having been guilty of "foul perjury." Lord Maidstone moved that he should be reprimanded in his place by the Speaker. A turbulent discussion ensued, and ended in the adjournment of the House. On the following day the debate was resumed. Upon a division the numbers were, for the reprimand 226, against it 197. As on more than one recent occasion, ministers were found voting with the minority. They pretended that a simple reprimand was not punishment enough—but they assuredly never thought of moving for any more severe penalty. On this occasion Lord John Russell was guilty of unusual heat and indiscretion. When Lord Maidstone first announced his intention of calling the great Irish agitator to account, he (Lord John) gave notice that, should that complaint be entertained by the House, he would bring forward on the same day an allegation of perjury made by the Bishop of Exeter, against certain members of the House.* This strange and inconsiderate menace entangled his lordship in considerable difficulties. A 'Free-men and Parliamentary Electors Bill,' which had dropped in the preceding session, was re-introduced before the Christmas recess. It had two objects—the one to relieve householders entitled to the elective franchise, by

* The obnoxious passage occurred in a charge to the clergy delivered by Dr. Philpot, the Bishop of Exeter, in 1836—He said, in reference to the Irish Temporalities Bill,—"In the discussion of the measure in Parliament, I felt it my duty to rest my resistance to it on this point—to denounce as treachery aggravated by perjury such an exercise of rights acquired under an oath not to weaken or disturb the Protestant religion."

extending the time fixed by the Reform Bill for payment of their rates and taxes from April to October; the other, to remove the stamp duty payable by freemen on their admission. The former branch of the bill met with considerable opposition on the Conservative side of the House. In committee, Mr. Thomas Duncombe moved an amendment which, in effect, would have altogether annulled the rate-paying clauses of the Reform Bill. He was supported by Mr. Warburton, Colonel Evans, and Mr. Hume, but his motion was negatived by 206 against 107. The bill itself, as originally framed, was carried through the Commons by slender majorities, but was rejected by the Lords on the second reading, on the 8th of March. The House of Commons, nevertheless, passed another bill, conceding the desired relief to freemen alone; but the session closed before the Lords could take it into consideration.

Mr. Grote made his annual motion for vote by ballot, and was out-voted by 315 to 198. It was noticeable that, although four cabinet ministers—Lord Howick, Lord Palmerston, Sir John Hobhouse, Mr. Spring Rice, the chancellor of the exchequer, voted with Lord John Russell against Mr. Grote, yet Mr. Poulett Thomson, president of the board of trade, the two attorneys-general, the lord advocate, Sir George Grey, colonial under-secretary, Sir Henry Parnell, treasurer of the ordnance, Mr. J. Parker, a lord of the treasury, and Mr. E. J. Stanley, the very *whipper-in* of the Whigs, absented themselves from the division; while Mr. Bernal, chairman of committees, Mr. Robert Steuart, a lord of the treasury, and Sir Hussey Vivian, master-general of the ordnance, voted for Mr. Grote against ministers. In consequence of this, and of other indications, rumours of ministerial discords and resignations became very current.

Mr. Slaney moved for leave to introduce a bill for the protection of voters, by making it a misdemeanor, with a summary process before magistrates, for any landlord, customer, master, or other person to interfere with the independent exercise of the elective franchise. The motion was carried in a thin House by a majority of more than two to one: and there the matter rested.

A bill was introduced by Mr. Warburton, and passed before the session closed, which had for its object to extend to personal property the privilege hitherto confined to real property, of conferring a qualification for parliament. By this enactment an estate for life, or a term of years, of which thirteen shall be unexpired at the time of election, or personal estate and effects of any kind, within the United Kingdom, or the interest of dividends of such may constitute the whole or part of the annual sum required to qualify a member. In the amount (300*l.* per annum) no alteration was made. The members for universities, and the eldest sons of peers, and of persons qualified to be knights of the shire, were, as matter of course, excluded from the scope of this statute.

The events which had taken place in Canada had drawn down severe criticism upon Lord Glenelg (formerly Mr. C. Grant), the colonial secretary. Sir W. Molesworth moved for an address to the queen, declaring that her majesty's present secretary for the colonies did not enjoy the confidence of the House of Commons or of the country, &c. Lord Palmerston said this was an attack, not upon Lord Glenelg alone, but upon the whole government. Lord Sandon moved as an amendment that an address should be presented to the queen, expressing the regret of the House at the treasonable movements in Canada, and their determination to support her in the suppression of the revolt, and the establishment of a sound constitution for those colonies; but representing also the opinion of the House that the present evil state of things in Canada was mainly owing to the want of foresight and energy, and to the ambiguous, dilatory, and irresolute course of her majesty's ministers. The debate occupied two nights; and, on a division, Lord Sandon's motion was negatived, but by a majority for ministers of only 29, the numbers being 316 to 287.

The anti-slavery agitation had not been set at rest by the Abolition Bill. Complaints were raised against the negro-apprenticeship system, and a cry was made for the *immediate* admission of the emancipated slaves into all the *rights* of free-labourers. Public meetings and petitions

were put very actively in operation. Lord Brougham opened the parliamentary discussion on the 29th of June, and before the session closed there was passed "An Act to amend the Act for the Abolition of Slavery," containing various provisions giving further protection to the negro-apprentices, and enforcing such regulations of the former act as had been disregarded by the planters.

There were very long and very warm debates on the Irish Poor-law Bill. Mr. O'Connell violently opposed the measure. He declared that he was opposed to the introduction of any poor-laws whatsoever into Ireland. After various amendments the bill, however, was carried through both Houses: The Irish Municipal Corporations Bill, having struggled with difficulty through the Commons, was so altered in the Lords, particularly by an amendment of Lord Lyndhurst's, that it came to a dead stop. The amendments were altered in the Commons; a useless conference was held between the two houses; and finally the Commons rejected their lordships' amendments. The Irish Tithes Commutation Bill was finally carried during the session, but without the appropriation clause, which ministers had abandoned. In the course of the debates on this subject, Sir Robert Peel frankly acknowledged that he was quite ready to support a moderate reform of the established Anglican Church in Ireland. Lord Brougham censured ministers for abandoning the appropriation clause, which, if properly carried into effect, might have greatly increased the means of popular education in Ireland.

In the course of a debate on the customary annual grant of 8928*l.* to the Irish Catholic College of Maynooth, Lord Morpeth made the first allusion in Parliament to the new Oxford School of divinity which we now denominate Puseyism. He said that these doctrines, which of late had become very fashionable at Oxford, had a strong savour of Romanism; and he read some extracts from a book which proceeded from that university, entitled, 'The Remains of the Rev. R. H. Froude,' and which certainly contained much that was averse to Protestantism.

The policy of the government with respect to Spain was once more severely criticised. Colonel Evans, who had been recently appointed a Knight Commander of the Bath, was present in the House to vindicate his own conduct, and the conduct of his Legion. He extenuated much that had been set down in malice, or carelessness, or sheer ignorance; but he could not disguise the facts that the expedition had been a calamitous failure, and that great and cruel wrong had been done to the brave people of the Biscayan provinces. Sir Henry Hardinge contended that Sir De Lacy Evans had by no means made out his case; and he proceeded to quote passages from various books and documents published by officers who had served in the Legion, all tending to corroborate the prevailing opinion on the subject, and to show that the dreadful sufferings of that corps were of the most revolting nature, and that both the insubordination of the Legion, as well as the punishments it provoked, were excessive.

In the Upper House the Quadruple Treaty, and the constructions put upon it by ministers, were censured by the Duke of Wellington, Lord Brougham, the Earl of Aberdeen, and others. It was contended that that treaty did not oblige us to blockade the coast of Spain as we had been doing. "Ministers," said the Duke, "ought to explain what they mean by the obligations of the treaty." The premier, Lord Melbourne, was obliged to confess that it was in no respects a treaty of alliance offensive and defensive with the Queen of Spain against the rest of the world—that any power had a right to assist Don Carlos. But, he added, whether the exercise of such right would lead to a war, was another question.

Ministers had conceived a prejudice against our volunteer yeomanry cavalry. This force had been reorganized in 1831, and at that period it consisted of 18,330 men; it was this year reduced by government by the amount of 4709 men. This step excited a good deal of dissatisfaction, more especially in the rural districts. Sir Robert Peel censured the reduction of this truly national and in-

expensive force. He denied that the yeomanry would be useless in time of war. It was true they could not garrison towns. But was there no danger of collision with the people at such a period? One of the most valuable points in this force was, that so long as it continued in existence, there was a dormant spirit in being, which might at any moment be called into activity for the protection of property. On the one hand, the loyal enjoyed a consciousness of strength and security, on the other, there was a dread of force, which awed the turbulent into peace. With respect to the inconvenience of summoning the vicinage in aid of the civil power, he had heard it alleged with great surprise; for it was one of the Saxon principles of the British constitution to impose on the vicinage the maintenance of the public peace.

Lord John Russell spoke of promoting a far more efficient and constitutional force—a good militia; but he did nothing in this direction, and when the Whigs left office, little more was left of our old militia than a scarcely visible staff.

A bill was carried through both Houses for the abolition of arrests for debts on mesne process. Mr. Serjeant Talfourd introduced a bill for extending the duration of copyrights to authors; but it met with no success. An international copyright bill was, however, passed during the session. It empowers her majesty in council to direct that the authors of books published abroad shall have a copyright here, provided there be a reciprocal protection in favour of this country, in the state in which such publications first make their appearance.

A bill was brought in by Lord Denman which aimed at a considerable alteration in the practice of administering oaths in courts of justice. It was divided into two parts, the first being framed with a view to declare and restore the common law of England, which allows any person who offers to speak the truth, according to the form binding on his conscience, to be admitted as a witness. Such an enactment was rendered necessary by

reason of certain difficulties which existed in Ireland, in the case of Presbyterians, who are sworn after a form of their own, and whose testimony could not on that account, according to the construction put upon a certain Irish statute passed in 1783, on some occasions be received in a court of justice. The noble and learned lord said, that the second and more important part of his bill, which provided that persons believing an oath to be unlawful, should be permitted to make affirmation in lieu thereof, was founded on a similar principle with the first. If it were not fit to impose on a witness an oath in a form which he thought unlawful, or which he did not consider to be binding, it was equally wrong and impolitic to impose any at all upon an individual whose conscience would not permit him to be sworn. The best principle was, in the learned lord's opinion, to elicit the truth in the form the most binding upon the consciences of the witnesses, and he appealed to the example of the Quakers and Moravians, whose affirmation was found by experience to answer all the purposes of the most solemn oath. He then presented a petition from certain inhabitants of London, who, though neither Quakers nor Moravians, thought oaths opposed to their duties as Christians, and in some cases had suffered severe hardships in consequence of their conscientious scruples.

The House of Lords however was not prepared to sanction so sweeping an innovation as would be implied in the entire abolition of the sanction of the oath; and after an endeavour upon the part of Lord Denman to modify his measure, with a view to diminish the prevailing objections, the bill was lost by a majority of 32 to 16.

The first clause of the bill was afterwards embodied in a separate statute, and passed the legislature in the course of the session. And the principle of the second clause was, by another act, extended to persons who *had been* Quakers or Moravians, though they might have since seceded from those sects.

Several complaints were made in the House of Lords during the session, respecting the mode pursued by the

lord chancellor in the nomination of magistrates in England and Scotland. It was more than insinuated that the noble and learned lord had no other than political motives for many of his appointments, and considerable dissatisfaction was the result amongst the Conservative lords-lieutenants of counties. Being attacked on this point by Lords Harewood and Warwick, the chancellor defended himself with great spirit. He said he fully approved of the old established custom of the lord chancellor's consulting the lords-lieutenants with respect to appointments to the magistracy, but that he could not consent to be told that he was not to exercise his own discretion, or that he was to put the great seal to any list that might be forwarded to him. But his lordship could not disprove the fact that he had almost invariably preferred Whig to Tory magistrates, —even as the Tories when in power had preferred men of their own party to Whigs.

The New Poor Laws again came under discussion in the House of Commons ; but ministers would allow of no mitigation to their severity.

Lord John Russell moved the re-appointment of a committee on church lands. He estimated the net revenue of the Church of England at 3,439,767*l.*, and calculated that this income would admit of a considerable increase. He denied that he had any intention of subtracting from this fund for education of the people, or for any other lay purpose. Mr. Liddell observed, " that government had been driven on to this mischievous question, which would unsettle men's minds and properties, by the clamour of persons strongly their supporters, but little distinguished as friends of the church ;" and he moved two sweeping amendments, the latter of which was lost only by a majority of 11, the numbers being, *ayes* 254, *noes* 265. And here, for the present, the matter rested.

Reprobating any *compulsory* system, Lord Brougham addressed himself to the subject of an improved, national, universal education, and moved two bills, by the provisions of which he hoped to remove the jealousies and an-

tipathies of the dissenters. One of the bills (both were conceived in a fair, impartial, enlightened spirit) was read a first time, but did not again come under the consideration of parliament during this session.

The appointment of Lord Durham, and that nobleman's conduct in Canada, had been very far indeed from giving universal satisfaction. Complaints were raised in Parliament against the enormous expenses of his mission, and, in defending his lordship, ministers were well nigh left in a minority. But the most terrible castigation inflicted on ministers and their nominee was inflicted in a single speech by Lord Brougham.

The minor proceedings in parliament, and an infinitude of debates, unattended by any important result, must be passed over in total silence.

On the 28th of June, the coronation of the young queen took place, amidst universal rejoicing. London had never witnessed so gay a sight, or seen so many approving happy faces. The country had half emptied itself upon the capital; the multitude assembled all along the line of procession, from Buckingham Palace to Westminster Abbey, was countless; yet was there no disorder, no accidents; and, on that day, even the pickpockets seemed to have suspended their operations, for fewer offences than ordinary came within the cognizance of the police. Next to her majesty and the Duke of Wellington, the personage most cheered by the English people was the Duke's old adversary, Marshal Soult, who had been sent over by Louis Philippe, as ambassador extraordinary, to attend the coronation.

About a month before the coronation, some astounding and almost incredible occurrences took place in the neighbourhood of Canterbury, where a madman had set himself up as a saint and prophet, and more. John Nicholls Thom, a respectable yeoman and malster and corn-factor of Cornwall, had become deranged in his intellect. Some years ago he had abruptly left his home, and made his appearance in the county of Kent, under the style and title of Sir William Courtenay, Knight of Malta. He had a tall advantageous person, which he

set off by a rich and unusual costume; his countenance was strikingly handsome; he had received a tolerable education, and his insanity and frenzy made him eloquent. He soon became famous among the men of Kent; the populace, attracted at first by his romantic appearance, flocked around him with enthusiasm, and even the superior classes of society furnished him occasionally with partisans. In the year 1833, he became a candidate for the representation of the city of Canterbury, and actually found plenty of people mad enough, or silly, or thoughtless enough to support him, for he polled 350 votes on the Conservative interest. Shortly after this he was convicted of perjury, and sentenced to six years' transportation. It was then that the symptoms of his insanity became unmistakeable. He was removed from Maidstone Gaol to the county lunatic asylum, where he remained in confinement about four years. In October, 1837, Lord John Russell, as secretary of state for the home department, thought proper to direct that he should be delivered up to his friends, upon their engaging to take charge of him. Thom reappeared in Kent, in the spring of the present year 1838. His conduct was far more extravagant than before; and the infatuation of the peasantry kept pace with it. To his political pretensions he now added others of a religious character; and his claims to a Divine mission, and even to Divine attributes, were implicitly recognised by some of the poor Kentish boors. He was acknowledged as another Messiah. He lived chiefly among the farmers of the neighbourhood of Boughton and Herne-hill, who supplied him with a little money as well as with provisions. In return he promised them that they should soon live on their farms without the odious necessity of paying rent. To the farm-labourers he made very inflammatory speeches, representing to them that they were oppressed by the laws in general, but more particularly by the New Poor Law. He told them that if they would place themselves under his command he would soon be king of Kent, and they should sit on his right hand on the day of his coronation. He assured them that he was invulnerable to steel or shot; and

nearly one hundred of the boors believed him. On Monday the 28th of May, they sallied forth from the village of Boughton, with a pole, a broken loaf, a flag of white and blue, and the effigies of a rampant lion. They made a great noise, and created a greater alarm throughout the neighbourhood. After visiting Goodnestone near Feversham, Herne-hill, Dargate-Common, Sittingbourne, Newnham Eastling, Lees, and other places, and after Thom had made harangues to the labourers in all those parts, they returned to Bossenden Farm on Wednesday evening. A farmer under the hill, having had his men seduced from their employment, at this time made an application for their apprehension, and a constable of the name of Mears, assisted by two others, proceeded on Thursday morning (the 31st) to execute his mission. After a little parley, Courtenay inquired which was the constable, and on Mears replying that he was, he immediately produced a pistol, and shot him; after which he inflicted a wound upon him with a dagger, and then with the assistance of some of the excited labourers, he threw the body into a ditch. The two other constables rode hastily back to the magistrates, who deemed it expedient to send off to Canterbury for military aid. A party of soldiers soon arrived, accompanied by several magistrates. But by this time the whole body of rioters had retreated into the depths of Bossenden Wood, where the pseudo-prophet was shouting, and encouraging his followers to behave like men. On perceiving the soldiers coming up through the glades, he advanced to meet them, and, having met, he deliberately shot the commanding officer, Lieutenant Bennett, of the 45th regiment, who was a few paces in advance of his party. The lieutenant fell dead on the spot; whereupon the soldiers fired and killed his murderer. As Thom fell to the earth, he exclaimed—"I have Jesus in my heart!" His followers had gathered behind him, thinking it impossible that he could be killed, or even so much as hurt. In a few seconds ten lives were lost, and several of the rioters badly wounded. After the maniac had fallen, a woman was seen kneeling over him, washing his face, and endeavouring to pour water through

his hard-closed lips. She said she had followed him with a pail of water, because he had told her, that if he fell, and she put water between his lips, he should arise again in a month. One of the prisoners told Major Armstrong, that they would have attacked two thousand soldiers, having been persuaded by the prophet that, while following him, they could not be shot. Some of his followers affirmed that they had seen the prophet shoot at a star in the heavens and hit it, and that they had seen the star fall plump into the sea. He had told them that he had come to earth on a cloud, and that on a cloud he should some day be removed from them.

Dense must have been the cloud of ignorance which overhung these fair, rural districts, scarcely fifty miles from our capital, and barely four from Canterbury, the metropolis of the Anglican church! Except under cover of such a cloud, popular credulity and fanaticism could never have reached to so monstrous a height. The delusion of those Kentish peasants was so great that for some time after the poor madman's death and burial, they expected to see him rise again and place himself at their head. Further tumults were apprehended, but none took place. The peasants retired quietly to their wonted labours, and soon began to wonder why they had quitted them. It is said, however, that even now, after the lapse of nine years, a few enthusiasts make pilgrimage to the green sward in Herne-hill churchyard which covers the mortal remains of their reputed saint.

A few years earlier the case might have been otherwise, but now judge and jury shrank from visiting the temporary insanity of the poor boors with condign punishment. Two were transported for life, one was transported for ten years, and six were sentenced to be imprisoned for one year with hard labour and one month's solitary confinement.

The great event of the year was the entire suppression of the unjustifiable, mad insurrection in Canada. Under Mackenzie and a few other totally inefficient leaders, they attacked Toronto, whence they were repulsed with loss. They then took possession of Navy Island, and

were joined by a number of "sympathisers," as they were called, from the United States. Here they were allowed to remain for some time, Sir Francis Head not deeming himself strong enough to attack them. In the mean time, it having been ascertained that an American vessel, the 'Caroline,' was lying with arms and men for their assistance off Fort Schlosser, in the territory of the United States, he caused it to be seized, which was done with some loss of life on both sides; it was then emptied of every person, fired, and sent drifting down the falls of Niagara. Navy Island was at length taken, the greater part of the rebels fled to the United States, and the insurrection was at an end. The ministry, however, were not satisfied with Sir Francis Head, who resigned, and was succeeded by Sir George Arthur till the arrival of Lord Durham. When Lord Durham arrived in Canada with his great powers, his object was not to punish but to conciliate these revolutionists. His lordship landed at Quebec on the 29th of May, and expressed himself highly gratified "with the more than friendly feeling which seemed to animate the assembled multitude." Like Sir Francis Head and other governors, Lord Durham received contradictory instructions from Lord Glenelg and the colonial office. On the 28th of June his lordship appointed a special Canadian council, which consisted of only five members, namely, Vice-Admiral Sir Charles Paget, Major-General Sir James Macdonnell, Colonel Couper, the governor's military secretary and principal aide-de-camp; Colonel Grey, and Mr. Charles Buller. This council thought fit to take proceedings against a few of the most notorious of the rebels. They issued an "ordinance" importing that Wolfred Nelson and seven others therein named, had acknowledged their participation in high treason, and submitted themselves to her majesty's pleasure; and that Papineau, with fifteen others also named, had absconded; and that it was enacted, that it should be lawful for her majesty to transport Nelson and his seven associates to Bermuda during pleasure, there to be subjected to such restraints as should be deemed fit; and further, that if any persons

of either of the above classes should be found at large, or within the province without permission, they should be deemed guilty of high treason, and, on conviction of being so found at large, or coming within the province, suffer death. The ordinance further empowered the governor for the time being, to grant, whenever he should think fit, permission to all or any of the above-named individuals to return to the province and reside therein. By a special clause, two other classes of persons, respectively implicated in the murders of Lieutenant Weir and of one Joseph Chartrand, were excluded from the operation of the ordinance, and also from the benefit of any amnesty which might thereafter be proclaimed.

The ordinance was accompanied by a proclamation of amnesty, which declared that, with the exception of the persons named therein, and whose cases were thereby provided for, all persons then in custody and charged with high treason, or other offences of a treasonable nature, or who had withdrawn themselves from justice beyond the limits of the province, should, on giving proper security, be at liberty to return to their homes. It also announced that no further proceedings would be taken against any persons, with the above exceptions, on account of political offences theretofore committed.

The Gazette, which communicated these instruments to the public, contained also the following notification:—
“We are authorised to state that his excellency the Governor-General is actively engaged in the preparation of measures which will, as soon as it may be possible, be embodied in ordinances of the governor and special council, relative to a jury law, a bankrupt law, municipal institutions for the whole province, general education, the establishment of registry offices, and the equitable commutation of feudal tenures.”

The exception in point of law was immediately seized upon at home, and objections of a more popular and general nature were raised in parliament, in the country, and by the newspaper-press. All this led to Lord Durham's entire overthrow.

Meanwhile the prisoners excepted from the amnesty

were deported to Bermuda. Sir Stephen Chapman, the governor of the Bermudas, was at once struck with his own want of legal authority in the matter; and the law-officers of the crown in that colony assured him that he had no power to impose, nor legal means to enforce, any restrictions upon the said prisoners with a view to their detention or otherwise. With this opinion before him, Sir Stephen at first doubted whether it would be expedient to allow the prisoners to be even landed on the island. He, however, resolved to receive them, and was content to exact from them their parole of honour, that, during their residence in the Bermudas, they would confine themselves within such limits as might from time to time be prescribed by the authorities. But Sir Stephen wrote to implore Lord Durham to remove these troublesome detenus as soon as possible, and not to send him any more.

The main attack upon Lord Durham was opened in the House of Lords by Lord Brougham on the 30th of July. His lordship showed how utterly the Canadian ordinance was at variance with the law. No power, he contended, to inflict pains and penalties upon individuals who had not been brought to trial was conferred upon Lord Durham. General laws for the good government of the colony he might make, but subject to an exception which restrained him from altering any act of the British parliament. Now the ordinance in question contravened the provisions of the Act 7 Wm. III. "For the Trial of Treasonable Offences." If Lord Durham had the power of dispensing with that act, he might condemn, in every case, as traitors, men against whom no witness had been examined, and into whose alleged offences no inquiry had been made.

Lord Glenelg observed that Lord Durham had been placed in a situation of extreme difficulty. On one side were parties calling for extreme punishments—on the other there was a demand for a complete amnesty. Lord Durham adopted a middle course; and when his decision was announced it gave general satisfaction throughout the colony.

Lord Brougham replied, that whatever the noble earl was desirous of doing in this respect might have been accomplished without a breach of the law. If he had said to parties accused or suspected, "I won't bring you to trial if you conduct yourselves properly," he would have effected his object in a legal manner. But instead of doing this, he said, "I shall send you to Bermuda, and if you leave that island I declare you guilty of high treason."

Lord Melbourne, after adverting to the very extraordinary circumstances of the country which Lord Durham was called upon to govern, said, it was not fair to the steps they had already taken, or just to the interests of this great empire, to dwell with such rigid criticism upon the first anomaly which might appear upon the face of these measures, or to lay stress upon every disparity which might exist between the practice in Canada and in this country. If the House considered that the powers intrusted to Lord Durham had been imprudently or unjustly exercised, it behoved them unquestionably to interfere. But if they did not see ground for such interference, then, said the noble lord, there is but one other course:—to exercise some confidence, to place some reliance, instead of constantly interrupting proceedings by perpetual comments on them, and weakening your own authority by condemnations which it is not intended to follow up. All governments, continued Lord Melbourne, had their faults and their errors, their *ingenta vitia*; and, in consequence of party spite, of political attacks one upon another, of personal dislikes and animosities, the enemies of the country, whether foreign or domestic, have always found their greatest assistance and encouragement in the bosom of the legislative assemblies of this country. His lordship gave up all that part of the ordinance which related to Bermuda, as illegal; but he contended that the rest was perfectly legal and warranted by the powers which Parliament had conferred on Lord Durham.

Lord Brougham brought in a bill "To make temporary provisions for the Government of Lower Canada," and

for indemnifying those who had acted under the ordinance. This bill in the end became in fact a bill of indemnity. The entire ordinance was annulled; and those who had been sent to the Bermudas were set at liberty and allowed to return to Canada, without suffering any further penalty, without giving any further security for their good behaviour.

The pride of Lord Durham was wounded, was cut to the quick. Conceiving that ministers had not supported him as they ought to have done, his lordship, without having been recalled, without having obtained leave to return, without so much as giving notice that he would return, hurried down to Quebec, and there embarked for England in the month of November. And for this precipitate conduct some there were who thought that Lord Durham was amenable to impeachment. The only way in which government resented his unprecedented step was to order that the usual salute should not be fired at his landing. He in consequence made his wife resign her place in the queen's household.

A.D. 1839.—At the opening of the year the Whig government was weak and tottering; and the country was as much excited by Chartism as it had formerly been by Radicalism. Nothing had more contributed to render the Government unpopular with the English and Scotch people than its continued and very close connexion with Mr. O'Connell and his Tail. The ministerial majority had been for some time past made up by these Irish members. The queen in her speech deplored the rebellion in Lower Canada, and the hostile incursions which had been made into Upper Canada "by certain lawless inhabitants of the United States of North America." "These violations of the public peace," said her majesty, "have been promptly suppressed by the valour of my troops and the loyalty of my Canadian subjects. The President of the United States has called upon the citizens of the Union to abstain from proceedings so incompatible with the friendly relations which subsist between England and the United States." The speech also deplored the spread of chartism at home, and the perse-

vering efforts which had been made in some parts of the country to excite the people to disobedience and resistance to the law, and to recommend dangerous and illegal practices.

Before the commencement of the debate upon the address in the House of Lords, and even before the speech had been read, Lord Durham asked the premier when he intended to lay upon the table that information respecting the affairs of Canada which was referred to in her majesty's speech. Lord Melbourne replied that it would be produced as soon as ministers had an opportunity of examining its contents. This intimation of delay, however short, gave great dissatisfaction to Lord Durham; and means were presently found for printing and publishing his famous "report," which was given in its original state; unmutated by official caution.

In the debate on the address the Duke of Wellington said that, although hundreds after hundreds of the persons who assailed the loyal portion of the Canadian population had been captured, so ineffectual seemed the laws that there had been no punishment, and no abatement put to the outrages. "Unless vigorous steps are speedily taken," said his grace, "you will find your province of Upper Canada treated much as Texas has been!" He entreated government to consider this as a great national war; to remember that it involved the highest national interests; to remember that it behoved them to proceed on a large scale of action if they desired to bring it to a safe and satisfactory conclusion. Without entertaining any doubt of the intentions of the President of the United States, his grace could not but feel regret when he saw American citizens coming armed into our territories, armed, too, with cannon belonging to the United States; nor could he avoid feeling astonishment when he was assured that it was out of the power of the American government to prevent such transactions.

The Corn Laws were prematurely forced into debate. Lord Melbourne stated that the Corn Laws had been ever since the formation of the present government an

entirely open question, a question on which the members of the administration had formed distinct opinions. "Unquestionably," said he, "the majority of these gentlemen are favourable to a change in the present system; but I am not willing to go into any debate on the Corn Laws now; I strongly wish to avoid it; but I have no reluctance to state my individual opinion on the subject: that opinion is, that though I am not prepared to pledge or bind myself to the maintenance of the present system as the best possible, I am not, at the same time, prepared, either as a member of parliament or as a member of the government, to pledge myself, from any information which I have, to an alteration of the law as it stands."

In the preceding year, which had witnessed insurrection and civil war in Canada, an Anglo-Indian army had been marched into the country of the Afghans, and a struggle had been commenced with the Chinese. Lord Brougham, having some anticipations of the manner in which the Afghanistan war would terminate, called the attention of parliament to the extensive operations of this war. His lordship said that because the King of Persia had done something that our East India statesmen did not like, they must, forsooth, march an army to dethrone the King of Cabul. "Of these Afghan kings he would say nothing. It would not be possible to say much good of any of them. But what kind of man were we now about to set up? A pretender—a mendicant pensioner on our charity—a man twice dethroned because he was hateful to his people in Cabul! The only reason for preferring him to Dost Mohammed, now on the throne, was, that the one was the legitimate and the other only the popular sovereign, whom the people preferred. Very different was our policy on this side of the Cape of Good Hope, where men recognized particular sovereigns because they happened to be the choice of the people, while they countenanced the rejection of others, who, possessing a legitimate character, were expelled by their subjects. Our empire in India was founded on opinion. He hoped sincerely that this opinion would not now be weakened by its being found that

we had marched six hundred miles to the north-west of India on a speculation of dethroning one king and putting another in his room."

In the Commons an amendment touching parliamentary reform was moved by Mr. T. Duncombe, and upon a division the numbers were 86 to 340.

In the month of February a great number of petitions began to appear, in either House, against the continuance of the Corn Laws. Lord Brougham moved that they should "be referred to a committee of the whole House, and that evidence be heard at the bar." The motion was opposed by Lord Melbourne and the Duke of Wellington, and was negatived without a division. A similar motion was made in the House of Commons by Mr. Villiers, but this was rejected by a large majority. Several members of the government voted with Mr. Villiers on this question.

The assassination of the Earl of Norbury in Ireland, in clear daylight, and the difficulty of getting any clue to the discovery of the murderers, created a dreadful excitement in that country, and could not be passed over in silence in parliament. Lord Roden moved for a committee on the state of Ireland. He was supported by the Duke of Wellington and by Lord Brougham, and opposed by Lord Melbourne and Lord Plunkett. Upon a division there appeared for Lord Roden's motion 63, and against it 58; ministers were thus outvoted by five. This proceeding in the House of Lords gave them singular dissatisfaction. On the very next day Lord John Russell rose in the Commons and announced his intention of taking the opinion of that house on the government of Ireland in late years. This subject, together with the Irish Municipal Corporations Bill, &c., occupied the house for a very long time. In the course of the debates Mr. O'Connell, and most of his Tail, disclaimed the duty of obedience to ministers, and were exceedingly personal and intemperate.

The interference of the legislature on the subject of West Indian slavery had indisposed the minds of the legislative assemblies in several of our West Indian

Colonies. In Jamaica the planters had become almost as mutinous as the Lower Canadians. The governor, Sir Lionel Smith, had been compelled to prorogue that assembly, who had declared that the parliament of Great Britain had violated their inherent rights, &c. A ministerial bill to suspend the existing constitution of Jamaica for five years was intrusted to the hands of Mr. Labouchere, and was now brought into the House of Commons as a specific for the cure of Jamaica insubordination. This brought matters to a crisis. The increase of unpopularity to the Whig ministry was incalculably great. Sir Robert Peel could put his foot upon this tyrannical bill, and stand out as the champion of liberty against Whiggish despotism. Sir Robert admitted that the conduct of the Jamaica assembly was open to censure, but, in his opinion, a far greater amount of blame was attaching to the course which had been taken by the ministry. It was impossible not to be aware of the serious consequences involved in the mode of proceeding now projected by ministers. It was proposed to suspend in a free colony the popular form of government which had existed for 200 years, and after a short interval of abeyance to revive it again. But was this so very easy of accomplishment? In a country, moreover, which had always been accustomed to impose its own taxation, it was in contemplation to vest in a governor and council, with three commissioners appointed by the crown, the authority of levying taxes to the amount of 500,000*l.* of money; and this at the same time that Lord Durham, in his report on Canada, recommended them to make the executive officers responsible to the control, not of the crown or home government, but of the popular colonial assembly. Another matter for grave consideration was, whether by exhibiting the emancipation of the negro as incompatible with a representative form of government, those who were desirous of the complete abolition of slavery were not deterring the slave-holding portion of the United States from the adoption of their experiment. This was, moreover, a measure calculated, in no slight degree, to alarm other colonies that were in the enjoy-

ment of a similar form of government. Many important considerations, said the right honourable baronet, called upon them to consider most maturely whether no other alternative could be adopted than the abolition of the constitution. The insolent language used by the assembly had been pleaded in justification of those proceedings; but could there be a more dangerous ground for legislation than the intemperate demeanour of a popular assembly? No popular government could be maintained for an hour if that ground were held to be justifiable. The assembly of Jamaica had possibly no inconsiderable grounds for provocation. When it was proposed last year to abolish the remaining term of negro apprenticeship, ministers very justly met the demand with a refusal, alleging that the national faith was pledged to the maintenance of the bill, or rather it was pledged to the full term of service, and that, independently of this consideration, it was better for it to continue till its proper expiration. This was right. But what did the House think of the governor of Jamaica holding language to the assembly to the effect that though parliament had refused to curtail the apprenticeship, they ought, nevertheless, to terminate it of themselves? When they found the executive authority combining with, perhaps he ought not to say physical force, but with the influence of numbers, no option was left them but to do that which the government at home refused to sanction, and abolish the apprenticeship. The colonial assembly was then entitled to some little indulgence.

On the 23rd of April, Sir Robert Peel stated that he would allow Mr. Labouchere's bill to be read *pro formâ*. Counsel could then be heard at the bar against the measure. Counsel were then heard, as, indeed, was the case on almost every stage of this bill, and the one which was afterwards substituted for it. On the 3rd of May, in opening the debate upon the question that the Speaker do now leave the chair, Sir Robert Peel could not help expressing his disappointment that it had not been found practicable to come to some arrangement with regard to the government of Jamaica, without any party conflict, or even any serious division of opinion on the course to

be pursued. He had looked in vain for any message delivered to the house lamenting the necessity, while it recommended the measure of suspending the functions of the representative assembly of Jamaica. The temporary abrogation of a popular form of government in Canada in the preceding year was by no means a precedent to be followed, lest it might seem to be a practice of the parliament to suspend a popular constitution every session. Up to this very hour, said the right honourable baronet, the colonists were entirely unaware of the heavy penalty about to be inflicted on them; they were without any intimation of these heavy accusations, and a most careful examination of all the papers bearing on the subject, enabled him to declare his most sincere opinion that there was no vindication in justice or in equity for the method upon which they were on the point of entering. "There are," said Mr. Canning in 1824, "three possible modes in which parliament might deal with the people of Jamaica. By the application of direct force we might crush them with a finger; we might harass them with fiscal regulations, restraining their navigation, or we might pursue the slow and steady course of authoritative admonition. Now, I am for trying first that which I have last mentioned. I trust we shall never be driven to the second; and, with respect to the first, I will only now say, that no feeling of wounded pride, no motive of questionable expediency, nothing short of real and demonstrable necessity, shall induce me to moot the awful question of the transcendental power of parliament over every dependency of the British Crown. That transcendental power is an arcanum of the empire which ought to be kept back within the penetralia of the constitution. It exists, but it should be veiled. It should not be produced in cases of petty refractoriness or temporary misconduct, nor, indeed, on any occasion short of the utmost extremity of the state." Adopting the sentiments of that great statesman, he was not prepared to admit that the necessity had arrived for bringing the transcendental power from the penetralia of the temple; and only wished the House would be made to perceive the probable consequences of the double precedent now

about to be set, and the general uneasiness that would be caused in other colonies, with half the force of his own deep conviction.

Sir Robert severely criticised every part of the bill.

The adjournment of the debate was moved by Mr. McLean, who opened the discussion on the Monday following, maintaining that in this measure, as in Mr. Fox's India Bill under Geo. III., the real object of the Whigs was to lay hands on the colonial power and patronage. Mr. Grote declared he was unable to discern in this bill any prospect of benefit to the blacks, while it betrayed many tokens of severity towards the white population. Mr. Goulburn observed that none of its supporters had defended the bill upon the grounds upon which it had been introduced. They all maintained that it was not possible for a body who had been accustomed to rule over slaves to make the laws necessary for those persons who had been emancipated. Gentlemen in that house were called upon to support this bill on the grounds that it favoured the interests of humanity—a delusive expectation, for it is well known that in the United States emancipation had been combated with redoubled acrimony since this country had given freedom to the slaves in her colonial possessions. Was it, indeed, to be hoped, continued Mr. Goulburn, that Virginia, Carolina, or Maryland, could ever be brought to liberate their blacks, when the people of those countries were given to understand by the British Parliament that emancipation was not possible without the abolition of existing free institutions—that emancipation and constitutional government could not go together?—Lord Stanley called this one of the most arbitrary measures that had ever been presented to a British House of Commons.—Lord John Russell closed the debate with a declamation against some former adherents who were about to desert him. The house then divided, when there appeared, against the bill 289, and for it only 294.

Upon this majority of five, the Melbourne cabinet sent in their resignation.

A week was allowed for the formation of a new

cabinet. On the 13th of May, after the lapse of those seven days, Sir Robert Peel proceeded to detail all the facts necessary for the explanation of his failure in forming a cabinet. At the queen's desire, he had waited upon her so soon as Lord Melbourne had resigned. Her majesty had already invited the Duke of Wellington to assist her in the formation of a government, and the duke had advised her majesty to send for him (Sir Robert) as the person best qualified to undertake the duties of prime minister. He had accordingly waited upon her majesty, who candidly avowed to him that she parted with her late administration with great regret, as they had given her entire satisfaction. The right honourable baronet went on to state, that it was not until the following day that any difficulty or misconception arose to lead to his relinquishing his attempt to form a new administration. That difficulty related exclusively to that portion of the royal household which is filled by the ladies in her majesty's service. He had little considered the subject, and with regard to the female part of the court, scarcely knew of whom it consisted. He took the red book in his hand, and there saw the different appointments. He said to those whom he intended to be his future colleagues, that with reference to all the subordinate appointments below the rank of a lady of the bed-chamber, he should propose no change to her majesty; and, with respect to the superior class, he took it for granted they would relieve him from any difficulty by at once relinquishing their offices. At the same time he thought it of great importance, as an indication of her majesty's confidence, that certain offices in the household of the higher rank, if not voluntarily relinquished by the ladies holding them, should be subject to some change, although in some instances the absence of all political feeling might render any such change unnecessary. On the Thursday, then, he saw her majesty, and verbal communications on this subject took place. Into the nature of those communications he would not enter; he would merely read the two letters which subsequently passed—one conveying the impressions of her majesty,

and the other his own. The letter which he had the honour of receiving from her majesty was dated May 10th, 1839. He received it at an early hour on Friday morning, and it was as follows :—

“*Buckingham Palace, May 10th, 1839.*

“The Queen, having considered the proposal made to her yesterday by Sir Robert Peel, to remove the ladies of her bedchamber, cannot consent to adopt a course which she conceives to be contrary to usage, and which is repugnant to her feelings.”

Upon receipt of this letter, he (Sir Robert) had written a long letter to the queen, explaining why he considered it indispensibly necessary that he should have that public proof of her majesty's entire support and confidence, which would be afforded by the permission to make some changes in that part of the household which her majesty had resolved on maintaining entirely without change. Continuing his explanations, Sir Robert complained of the gross misrepresentations which had been circulated in society and by the newspapers. He had been represented as calling for the dismissal of the whole of the ladies of the household—as having cruelly insisted on the instant removal of her majesty's earliest friend, the Baroness Lehzen.

“Could I,” continued Sir Robert, “look around me at this stormy time, and not see that it was my absolute duty to this country, and above all to her majesty, to require that every aid that could be given me should be given? What were the questions which would immediately press for my decision? The state of India—the state of Jamaica—the state of Canada—would all require my immediate consideration. I also considered the internal state of this country; I looked at the Chartists—I saw insurrection in our provinces—I saw the letter of the noble lord opposite (Lord John Russell), inviting the respectable part of the population to form themselves into armed societies for resisting outrage. Surely in addition to the ordinary difficulties besetting the course of a *prime minister*, there are circumstances that render

that position at the present moment peculiarly onerous and arduous. I should have had to begin the government in a minority. Who can conceal from himself that my difficulties were not Canada; that my difficulties were not Jamaica; *but my difficulties were Ireland*—(ironical cheers). I admit it fully, and thank you for the confirmation of my argument, which those cheers afford. And what is the fact? I, undertaking to be a minister of the crown, and wishing to carry on public affairs through the intervention of the present House of Commons; in order that I might exempt the country from the agitation and possibly the peril of a dissolution—I, upon that very question of Ireland, should have begun in a minority of upwards of twenty members. A majority of twenty-two had decided in favour of the policy of the Irish government. The chief members of the Irish government, whose policy was so approved of, were the Marquess of Normanby and the noble lord opposite, the member for Yorkshire (Lord Morpeth). By whom are the two chief offices in the household at this moment held? By the sister of Lord Morpeth and the wife of Lord Normanby.

“ But the question is, would it be considered by the public that a minister had the confidence of the crown, when the relatives of his immediate political opponents held the highest offices about the person of the sovereign? My impression decidedly was that I should not appear to the country to be in possession of that confidence, and that impression I could not overcome; and upon that impression I resolved to act. Who were my political opponents? Why, of the two I have named, one, the Marquess of Normanby, was publicly stated to be a candidate for the very same office which it was proposed I should fill, namely, the office of prime minister. The other noble lord (Lord Morpeth) has been designated as the leader of this House; and I know not why his talents might not justify his appointment in case of the retirement of his predecessor. Is it possible—I ask you to go back to other times; take Pitt or Fox, or any other minister of this proud country, and answer for

yourselves this question—is it fitting that one man shall be the minister, responsible for the most arduous charge that can fall to the lot of man ; and that the wife of the other—that other his most formidable political enemy—shall, with his express consent, hold office in immediate attendance on the sovereign? Oh, no! I felt it was impossible—I could not consent to this.”

Lord Melbourne's cabinet was, therefore, restored ; but it was weakened and without prestige. On the 27th of May, as soon as the ministry had been reconstructed, the House met for the election of a new Speaker in the room of Mr. Abercromby, who had three weeks previously declared his intention of resigning, having no longer sufficient strength to perform the arduous duties imposed on him by the office. He had on that occasion received through Sir Robert Peel and Lord John Russell the highest testimonies as to the esteem in which he was held by the two great parties, not only for his conduct in the chair, but also for his strenuous exertions to improve the mode of conducting the private business of the House. This worthy son of the brave, good, and morally great, General Sir Ralph Abercromby, had since been called to the House of Peers by the title of Lord Dunfermline.

Mr. Shaw Lefevre, member for North Hants, was proposed for the vacant chair by the Ministerialists, and Mr. Goulburn, member for the University of Cambridge, by the Opposition. The former gentleman was chosen by a majority of 18, the numbers being 317 against 299.

Since the year 1833, the sum of 20,000*l.* had been annually granted by parliament in aid of the great work of national education. It was now felt that much more ought to be done for this great object. Lord John Russell presented a ministerial plan. He proposed that the president of the council and other privy councillors not exceeding five, should form a board, to consider in what manner the grants made by parliament should be distributed. He also stated that, in his opinion, the first object of such a board should be, the establishment of a *good normal school* ; and that in order to make such a

school as perfect as possible, attention should be mainly directed to four objects: 1st, Religious instruction; 2nd, General education; 3rd, Moral training; 4th, Habits of industry applied in learning some trade or profession. The project was opposed by the high church party, who considered that sufficient security would not be given to the church, and it was opposed still more vehemently by the dissenters, who conceived that in a state education, in a country where church and state were linked together, sufficient consideration would not be paid to their several tenets. After some very interesting debates in both Houses, the matter was left to rest nearly as it was before. Lord Brougham brought forward a plan of his own, but the consideration of it was adjourned until the next session.

The affairs of Canada long engaged the attention of parliament. On the 3rd of May Lord Melbourne presented the following message from the queen:—

“ Her majesty thinks it proper to acquaint the House of Lords, that it appears to her majesty that the future welfare of her majesty’s subjects in Upper and Lower Canada would be promoted by the union of the said provinces into one province, for the purpose of legislation, from and after the period to be fixed by parliament.

“ Her majesty, therefore, recommends it to the House to consider such measures as may be submitted to them for that purpose.

“ Her majesty is persuaded that the House of Lords will be careful to combine a due regard for the peace and security of these important provinces with such provisions as may be conducive to the welfare of England, and the permanent freedom and prosperity of her North American provinces.”

The Act of 3 and 4 Vict. c. 35, for the union of the provinces, was not, however, passed until the 23rd of July, 1840, ministers in the meanwhile having recourse to temporary measures, which were most severely criticised by Lord Lyndhurst.

A second Jamaica bill was passed, after it had undergone important amendments in the Upper House.

The important subject of colonization now forced itself upon the public attention, and upon the attention of parliament. Mr. Ward moved a series of resolutions, but did not press his motion to a division. His speech, however, was very suggestive.

The question of the Portuguese Slave Trade—a trade still actively pursued—was brought under discussion in the Commons by Sir Robert Inglis. Lord Palmerston, secretary for foreign affairs, confessed that, after four years spent in negotiation, a note had just been received from Lord Howard de Walden, our ambassador at Lisbon, in which it was stated that he no longer entertained any hopes of procuring the assent of the Portuguese cabinet to a treaty for the suppression of the traffic. It was, therefore, the intention of the government, after having laid on the table the whole of the papers relating to their intercourse with Portugal, to introduce a bill, which should give to her majesty's cruisers and commissioners the same right of search, with regard to slave-trading vessels met with below the line, which they already possessed in the case of those which were found north of the equator.

A bill was accordingly introduced on the 10th of July, and passed throughout all its stages *sub silentio*, until it arrived at the second reading in the House of Lords. On this occasion, the Earl of Minto thought it necessary to make a short statement of the present condition of the law relating to the slave-trade, and the existing treaties between Great Britain and Portugal, before he entered into any explanation of the objects of the present bill. The most important treaty was that of 1815. The slave-trade was declared illegal, and Portugal undertook to bring about eventually its entire abolition, consenting in the meantime not to suffer her flag to be employed in that traffic for any other purpose than to furnish slaves for her own transatlantic dominions. In consideration of this concession, Great Britain agreed to remit the balance of a debt, amounting to 600,000*l.*, due by Portugal to this country; which was thus paid down to Portugal as the price of her compliance. Lord

Minto went on to say that notwithstanding this and other solemn engagements, the traffic had been almost entirely carried on under the flags of Portugal and Spain. With the latter country, however, we had concluded a very efficient treaty, which gave us the power of seizing vessels equipped for the slave-trade, without waiting till they had taken on board their miserable cargo, and there were hopes that this would have the effect of thoroughly extinguishing it. It was, therefore, extremely desirable that we should obtain similar conditions from Portugal.

The Duke of Wellington admitted that the object of all the treaties of 1810, 1815, and 1817, was to arrive at the total suppression of the infamous traffic in question, nor could there be any doubt but that this country had a full right to call upon Portugal to carry the obligation she had contracted effectually into execution; he contended, however, that the right of enforcing the due observance of such provisions did not lie within the province of parliament.

When the House divided, the bill was rejected by 38 against 32.

On the following evening Lord Brougham moved, "That an humble address be presented to her majesty, praying her majesty, by all the means within her majesty's power, to negotiate with the governments of foreign nations, as well in America as in Europe, for their concurrence in effectually putting down the traffic in slaves; and also that her majesty will be graciously pleased to give such orders to her majesty's cruisers, as may be most efficacious in stopping the said traffic, more especially that carried on under the Portuguese and Brazilian flags, or by Brazilian and Portuguese ships; assuring her majesty that this House will cheerfully concur with the other House of Parliament in whatever measure might be rendered necessary, if her majesty shall be graciously pleased to comply with this prayer."

Lord Brougham assured the Duke of Wellington that in voting for this address he could not possibly stand committed to anything beyond a general declaration of

readiness to countenance the government in any legitimate attempt to abolish the slave-trade. The resolution was agreed to, and ordered to be communicated to the other House of Parliament. In the Commons Lord Palmerston brought in another bill, in the place of that which the Lords had rejected; and this was eventually carried through both Houses, after an amendment introduced by Lord Lyndhurst. The Duke of Wellington protested against the bill, as a breach of the law of nations, as a violation of national treaties, and as tending rather to encourage than to prevent the traffic against which its enactments were directed. And, in fact, the slave-trade has scarcely been diminished since the passing of the act, while new horrors have been added to it, in order that, at whatsoever risk, it might still be rendered profitable to those engaged in it.

Mr. Grote made another unsuccessful motion for the ballot. Mr. Attwood moved for a committee of the whole House to take into consideration what was called the "National petition." The honourable agitator explained that this enormous instrument was signed by no fewer than 1,200,000 persons, the *élite* of the working classes, who put forward five demands—1. Universal suffrage. 2. Vote by ballot. 3. Annual parliaments. 4. Remuneration of members for their attendance in parliament. 5. The abolition of the property qualification. The proposal was rejected by 235 against 189. There followed very alarming riots, attended with extensive destruction of property at Birmingham; and ministers found themselves obliged to advance 10,000*l.* out of the consolidated fund, for establishing an efficient police force at Birmingham, and to call for an addition of 5000 men to the army. Bills were also passed to improve the police in Manchester and Bolton, and to give more power to the justices of the peace for appointing constables, &c.

The chancellor of the exchequer, Mr. Spring Rice, took a cheerful view of the commercial prospects of the country. Our exports had considerably increased. The *amount of deposits* in the savings banks had also very

much risen, notwithstanding the insubordination of the chartists, and the attempts which had been made to create a run upon those banks. After these explanations Mr. Spring Rice introduced the scheme for a uniform penny postage. This plan had been formed and matured by Mr. Rowland Hill, the brother of the late member for Hull, who had so excited the fury of the Irish members: after many objections, and a long and stern opposition, the measure was carried. It has proved an inestimable blessing to the community.

Many other projected reforms were postponed by ministers, who felt that they had not parliamentary strength enough to carry them. At the close of the session, Lord Brougham affirmed that the country would be glad to see the Conservatives restored to office; for they would, as a matter of course, be compelled to grant reforms, and they would possess the power of passing measures of administrative improvement, which the present cabinet had neither the will to introduce nor the means of carrying.

The queen prorogued parliament on the 27th of August. Her majesty's speech announced that, at last, a definitive treaty between Holland and Belgium had settled the differences between those two countries, and had secured the peace of Europe from dangers to which it had been so long exposed.

Shortly after the close of the session very considerable alterations were made in the cabinet, in the hope of gaining strength. The Marquess of Normanby changed places with Lord John Russell; Mr. Francis Baring was made chancellor of the exchequer in lieu of Mr. Spring Rice, who was raised to the peerage by the title of Baron Monteagle, and soon after succeeded Sir John Newport, who was induced to retire upon a pension, in the post of comptroller of the Exchequer, with a salary of 2000*l.* per annum; Mr. Poulett Thompson was appointed to supersede Sir John Colborne in the government of Canada; the Earl of Clarendon took the privy seal; Mr. Thomas Babington Macaulay was made secretary at war, with a seat in the cabinet. Lord Howick,

who had retired from the office into which Mr. Macaulay was placed, and who, while in it, had given great satisfaction to the army, now offered very satisfactory explanations of the reasons which had induced him to quit this enfeebled government. Mr. Charles Wood, secretary of the admiralty, and brother-in-law to Lord Howick, resigned shortly after, and was succeeded by Mr. More O'Ferral. Two other Irish members were brought in, Mr. Wyse filling the vacated seat among the lords of the treasury, and Mr. Shiel being created vice-president of the board of trade. Sir George Grey was taken into the cabinet; Mr. Labouchere became president of the board of trade in the room of Mr. Poulett Thompson; and Mr. Vernon Smith became under secretary for the colonies.

On the 23rd of November, her majesty announced to the members of the privy council assembled at Buckingham Palace, her intention of contracting a matrimonial alliance with the Prince Albert of Saxe-Coburg and Gotha.

The chartists had created more or less confusion in all our manufacturing districts. Towards the close of the year, Frost, a bankrupt linen-draper, of Newport, in Monmouthshire (who some years before had been created a magistrate by Lord John Russell, in spite of a strong remonstrance), stirred up a miserable commotion in Monmouthshire. He persuaded a most uneducated rabble that they would all be made wealthy and happy by and through the charter, with its vote by ballot, annual parliaments, salaried members, division of property, &c. &c.; that the charter was not to be obtained except by revolution beginning in civil war; and that he, John Frost, the broken linen-draper, was the man to conduct this revolution. He had correspondents; he had friends and allies among the chartists and unionists of Birmingham, Manchester, Bolton, Sheffield; he had "sympathisers" all through the north, and surely these hardy men would not be inactive when he had struck his first good blow. The stoppage of the mail-coaches would be the signal—as agreed upon—for these heavy-handed heroes of *Lancashire and Yorkshire* to rise and be doing. One

company of regular troops, commanded by a young lieutenant, and a few constables under the orders of Sir Thomas Philips, the mayor of Newport, knocked Frost and his grand scheme on the head. On the evening of Sunday, the 4th of November, the insurgents, to the number of 4000 or 5000, moved down, through Tredegar Park, upon Newport. They marched in something like martial order, five abreast, armed some with guns, others with bludgeons, others with pikes or pick-axes. The troops were stationed in the Westgate Inn, on the market-place, the door of which was guarded by special constables. The insurgents called upon them to surrender, and, receiving a refusal, the word was given by Frost, or one of his superior officers, to fire; and a volley was forthwith discharged against the bow-window of the room wherein the military were stationed. At nearly the same moment, the rioters broke open a door of the inn, and poured through the hall into the house. Now was it time for the soldiers to look to themselves; a moment's delay might have ended in a massacre. The word was given in the room to fire, and the soldiers fired down the passage through which the Frostites were advancing. At the same moment Lieutenant Grey, with the worshipful mayor, who behaved with much more than common civic gallantry, and Serjeant Daley, opened each one of the shutters of the window that gave upon the street. A shower of slugs was immediately poured in by the insurgents, and the mayor and several other persons were wounded; but the oblique sides of the windows enabled the men to open a severe raking discharge upon the mob, who, after standing a few rounds, broke away and fled in all directions, leaving behind them a good many killed or severely wounded. Frost was captured in the course of the evening in Newport. Zephaniah Williams, and one Jones, who were bringing up other columns of attack, but who arrived too late to take part in the action, and had no heart to begin a new one when the first was over, disbanded their men and fled. They were both captured shortly after, and were indicted with Frost and several others for high treason. A

special commission, presided over by Sir Nicholas Tindal, the admirable chief justice of the common pleas, was sent down to Monmouth to try the rioters. Sentence of death was recorded against Frost, Williams, and Jones: but the punishment was ultimately commuted to transportation for life.

The coming events in Afghanistan were casting very black shadows before them. The sanguine and uninformed were looking only to the easy advance our armies had made to Cabul; the wary and well-informed—the Duke of Wellington, and the few men like him—were thinking how that army would ever get back to the banks of the Indus. The troubles in China went on increasing.

A.D. 1840.—The parliament was opened by her majesty in person on the 16th of January. The first paragraph of the speech announced her majesty's approaching marriage. Her majesty congratulated the parliament on the satisfactory termination of the civil war which had so long desolated the northern provinces of Spain; and mentioned as a subject of great satisfaction the *success* of the European and native troops in India, in the expedition against Afghanistan.

Both Houses congratulated her majesty on her happy choice of a consort. With very little loss of time Lord John Russell moved "That her majesty be enabled to grant an annual sum, not exceeding 50,000*l.*, out of the consolidated fund, for a provision to Prince Albert, to commence on the day of his marriage with her majesty, and to continue during his life." Mr. Hume said that 21,000*l.* per annum would be quite enough; and he moved an amendment to that effect, which was negatived by 305 against 38. Colonel Sibthorp then moved that the grant should be for 30,000*l.*; and he was supported by Sir Robert Peel, and by all the Conservative members, except Sir Robert Inglis; and upon a division this amendment was carried by 262 against 158. This was considered as a remarkable triumph over ministers, and as a plain proof of the uncertain tenure by which they held office.

The government was very severely censured for the

riots at Newport, and for the disorders in Yorkshire and elsewhere. Sir John Yarde Buller moved a vote of want of confidence in ministers, assigning, as the chief ground for such vote, the disturbed and unsatisfactory state of the country—a state which he mainly ascribed to the system of popular agitation which ministers had themselves nurtured and encouraged in preceding years. He said that in Ireland a similar system had been pursued, and had been carried much farther than in England; that, instead of checking or discouraging the chief author of these most unconstitutional proceedings, government had placed some of his family and connexions in situations of trust and emolument, and he had himself been received as a guest at the lord-lieutenant's table. Another ground which rendered her majesty's ministers, in Sir John Y. Buller's opinion, undeserving of the confidence of the country, was the apparent coalition with those who were uniformly hostile to the established church of this realm. On first taking office these ministers had declared that they would put an end to all sinecures and unfair pensions, and they had endeavoured to bring all former governments into disrepute by denouncing their corruption and extravagance in these matters. "And yet," said Sir John, "in spite of all their professions, they had really made a more corrupt use of the patronage of the Crown than any of the governments which preceded them. Only the other day they granted 1000*l.* a-year as a pension to a gentleman who retired from his sinecure office, in order that he might be succeeded by the retiring chancellor of the exchequer." Another ground of complaint was the uncertainty attending all their measures. Lord John Russell voted last session against the introduction of the vote by ballot, and regretted that the honourable member for Edinburgh should not have more maturely considered his opinions on this subject. And now, what was the case? The honourable member for Edinburgh (Mr. T. B. Macaulay) *was secretary-at-war, and a member of the Cabinet.* The honourable baronet alluded to another point as being important. Lord Melbourne had recently pre-

sented at court to the young and virtuous queen, just about to enter the holy state of matrimony, the notorious Robert Owen, who was opposed to marriage, who was opposed to every branch or portion of Christianity—who entertained, and who had long been publicly lecturing upon, projects and views identical with those entertained by the Chartists and John Frost! The honourable baronet was seconded by Alderman Thompson. The motion was defeated, but only by a majority of 21, the numbers dividing being 287 against 308.

By this time dreadful news began to arrive from India—news of events which had scarcely had a parallel in British history. Hence fresh discredit fell upon the existing government. At the same time ministers were warmly attacked for the conflicting instructions they had sent out to our officers and authorities in China. Sir Robert Peel most convincingly demonstrated that government had not furnished our chief superintendent there with proper powers. Upon this China question the ministerial majority sank to 9.

The affairs of Ireland were still more embarrassing. They carried through both Houses the Irish Municipal Corporations Bill; but they were obliged to let drop their English and Irish Registration Bills, and their scheme for settling the poor law in Ireland.

The finances of the country now presented such an aspect that the Commons were obliged to look the affairs of the nation fairly in the face. An alarming deficiency was apprehended. There had been already, in the course of three years, an actual deficiency of six millions; and the chancellor of the exchequer (Mr. Baring) seemed not ready with any measure by which to make this up.

Mr. Ewart made an unsuccessful motion for the total abolition of capital punishments. Mr. Serjeant Talfourd brought in a bill for securing to authors and their families a longer enjoyment of the profits derivable from copyrights. He was opposed by Mr. Warburton, by Mr. Joseph Hume, Mr. Wakley, and others, and found himself *under the necessity of dropping the measure.* The

bill was not the wisest which might have been framed; but it certainly contained more generous and better principles than Lord Mahon's bill which Mr. Macaulay helped in carrying through parliament in 1842.

In consequence of a message from the crown, a bill was passed appointing his royal highness Prince Albert regent, in the possible event of her majesty's decease, during the minority of her children. On the 11th of August the queen went down to the Lords and prorogued parliament. The speech stated that she was engaged in concert with the Emperor of Austria, the King of Prussia, the Emperor of Russia, and the Sultan, in measures intended to affect the permanent pacification of the Levant, and to maintain the integrity and independence of the Ottoman empire:—that the violent injuries inflicted upon some of her subjects by the officers of the Emperor of China had compelled her to send to the coast of China a naval and military force.

But the absorbing subject now was the terrible disasters in Afghanistan.*

The present governor-general was Lord Auckland, a very amiable nobleman, who, since the accession of the Whigs to power, had passed through the various offices of president of the board of trade, and master of the mint, and first lord of the admiralty. By character, and by habits of life and of thought, Lord Auckland, it was supposed, would be sure to prefer the pacific and non-interfering system to every other. And yet, alas! his lordship had not been long in India ere he was dragged into an unnecessary war—a war attended not with conquest and aggrandisement, not with an increase of security to ourselves and to our allies and dependants, but with defeat, frightful disasters, and such an amount of disgrace as never fell upon our arms in any part of the world.

His lordship admitted into his entire confidence Captain Alexander Burnes and other stirring over-confident officers of the Company, who were impatient for opportunities of distinguishing themselves as soldiers or diplo-

* 'Our Indian Empire.'

matists, or as both, and who (principally, as we believe, through this anxiety) had been induced to believe that our Indian empire was threatened by Russian intrigues and by Persian and Afghan arms. It was the Russian bugbear that was the primary cause of all our woe, and of all our shame. As the Mahrattas had been thoroughly conquered, the Pindarrees extirpated, the Nepaulese and Burmese checked, driven back, and reduced to order, and as even the Jauts and Bhurtpoor had been disposed of, there was absolutely nothing to fear from any of our neighbours or old foes, and therefore it was that our unfledged Indian statesmen looked for possible foes 600, or 1200, or more miles beyond our frontier,—to the mountains of Afghanistan, the plains of Bokhara, the deserts, the frontiers of Persia, and the shores of the Caspian Sea.

Although, in former years, the Afghans had frequently spread devastation through the upper provinces of India, they had ceased to be an object of alarm ever since the mission to Cabul of the Honourable Mountstuart Elphinstone in 1809. They had never been enabled to cross the Indus. Instead of descending in that direction, they had been driven back considerably to the north by the Ameers of Sind and Runjeet Sing, the Lion of Lahore. The same state of constant war and anarchy which Mr. Elphinstone saw in Afghanistan, had continued ever since, or, rather, it had become much worse. In fact, the Afghan monarchy had been dismembered.

In 1809 Shah Sujah had been vanquished in battle, and had been compelled to fly for refuge into the territories of Runjeet Sing. The authority of the usurper, Shah Mahmood, was acknowledged in part of Afghanistan, the rest of the country submitting to the misrule of divers chiefs or princes, who were frequently at war with each other. Shah Mahmood's brothers revolted against him, and his authority was soon confined to Herat and its dependencies. Cabul, Candahar, and Peshawer, were held by different brothers of Mahmood, who soon fell out amongst themselves. During this decay of the monarchy

Runjeet Sing, the Lion of Lahore, was rapidly improving the discipline of his army by means of European officers. The final downfall of Bonaparte, in 1815, broke up the trade of war in Europe, and drove a considerable number of adventurers, Frenchmen and Italians, to the East, to Persia, and even into India. Some of these men found their way to Lahore, and under their care the troops of Runjeet Sing were trained. The Lion* became irresistible: he took Cashmere, Mooltan, Leia, Upper Sinde, and the nearest part of Damaun, and reduced all the Afghan tribes south of Cashmere. After this, taking advantage of a quarrel and war between the Dooraunee prince of Cabul and his brother at Peshawer, and of an expedition which he enabled the expelled Shah Sujah, who had long been his guest, to make against Candahar, Runjeet Sing succeeded in conquering Peshawer himself, with all the level country which the Afghans had occupied between the mountains and the river Indus. The Ameers of Sinde seized upon other territories which had belonged to the Dooraunee monarchy. Balkh threw off its nominal dependence, and in other territories of vast extent and thin population which lie between India and Persia, and which had all obeyed Zemaun Shah, various chiefs and princes asserted their independence. Dost Mohamed, however, maintained himself at Cabul, and his brother, or half-brother, after a sharp contest with the Shah Sujah, remained master of Candahar.

Their brother Mahmood died, or was secretly murdered, at Herat, and was succeeded by his son Khamran or Camraum, who appears to have made some fruitless attempts to recover from his uncle, Dost Mohamed, the dominion of Cabul. The unfortunate Shah Sujah, having failed in other expeditions and enterprises undertaken in concert with Runjeet Sing, was at one time perfidiously seized and barbarously treated by the ungenerous Lion of Lahore, whose main object was to extort from him the famous Afghan diamond called the Cohi Noor: he was delivered from his cruel captivity by the spirit and ability

* Runjeet Sing.

of his queen. After all these adventures, Shah Sujah again found a safe asylum beyond the River Sutledge, in the British cantonment of Lodiana, where a liberal pension was allowed him.

War followed between Dost Mohamed Khan and Runjeet Sing. A victory, gained by the Afghans in 1836, was thrown away through the feuds and jealousies of the chieftains; and the Lion of Lahore, instead of losing territory, soon began to make new conquests. Dost Mohamed had been constantly seeking for the friendship of the British government; but by the treaty made between Lord William Bentinck and Runjeet Sing in 1831, Runjeet was allowed to do what he pleased in the country beyond the Sutledge; and all notion of our succouring the distracted Afghan monarchy was given up. Dost Mohamed had then applied not only to the Persians and to the Tartars, but also to the *Russians*, for aid and assistance. The young Shah of Persia, who had succeeded his grandfather in 1834, had lost no time in responding to Dost Mohamed's desired alliance. The court of Teheran hoped that whilst Runjeet Sing and the Seiks were pressing upon Afghanistan on one side, a Persian army, favoured still further by the dissensions of the Afghan rulers and chiefs, might easily make conquests on the other, recover Herat, and establish the dominion of the young Shah at least over the whole of Khorassan and Candahar. Khamran, the Afghan ruler of Herat, on the death of the old Shah of Persia in 1834, had made a predatory incursion into the Persian territories, in concert with Turcomans, Hazarees, and other robbers, and had captured some thousands of Persian subjects for the purpose of selling them as slaves in Central Asia. Although this wholesale kidnapping was a very ancient practice, it certainly seemed, of itself, to justify the young shah in marching an army against Herat and the Afghan ruler Khamran. At the same time, he was invited and pressed to the enterprise by most of the Afghan Sirdars of Candahar, who had long been engaged in a blood feud with Khamran, and who, for the gratification of their vengeance, were willing to bring their old enemies,

the Persians, even into the heart of Afghanistan Proper. But when it was found, or rather suspected, by our mission at Teheran, that the young Shah of Persia had been encouraged and promised pecuniary assistance by the Russians, who, it was reasoned, must know that the conquest of Herat and Candahar by the Persians would be, in fact, an advance gained for the Russians towards India, if not for the purpose of actual invasion, certainly for that of intrigue and disorganization, great alarm was felt by our mission, and was by them communicated from Teheran to Downing-street. In short, our ministers at home, and our diplomatists in Persia, were suddenly excited by all that jealousy and dread of Russia which had been diffused through the greater part of our Indian government by Burnes and others. The cabinet of St. Petersburg must have laughed at this groundless panic; and it was quite in keeping with the crooked policy of that cabinet to resort to sundry paltry and secret measures in order to keep up the panic, while they were publicly assuring Lord Palmerston (and so far with perfect truth) that they entertained no designs of aggrandisement on the side of India. In spite of all the remonstrances of our ambassador, the young shah, in July, 1837, put himself and an army of 40,000 men, with seventy pieces of artillery, on their march from Teheran to Herat. Owing to their empty treasury, defective commissariat, and want of discipline, this Persian army frequently threatened to melt away before they had seen an enemy; and when they approached Herat they were but a miserable and half-starved rabble. Nothing could be more unlike the vanguard of a mighty force competent to overthrow our empire in the East. Unhappily, at this moment, Captain Burnes was at Cabul, and there came in contact with a certain Captain Vicovich, who gave himself out, among the Afghans, as an envoy from the court of Petersburg. This drove the previous insanity of our Indian statesmen into downright madness. Cost what it might, Dost Mohamed must be driven out of Cabul, or we should soon see a Russian army there! Yet, after this, the Dost offered to ally himself with us if we would only

protect him against the Persians. Lord Auckland declared, in a minute, that he would not oppose the hostile advance of Persia either by arms or by money. His lordship must have known, by this time, that the Persians had no chance of making such advance, and that the operations contemplated by his government in the Persian Gulf would make the young Shah fly back towards Teheran, even though he should have reduced Herat previously.

On returning to the Governor-General, Captain Burnes, whose opinions seem to have varied according to times and circumstances, and the opinions of other men higher in office than himself, declared that Dost Mohamed was an irreconcilable enemy ; that our guest, the dethroned Shah Sujah, had many friends in the country, and that with a little aid of men and money he might advance to Cabul in triumph, and without bloodshed. Yet, not long before this, Burnes had represented Shah Sujah as an imbecile prince, without a party in his own country, and Dost Mohamed as the best ally the governor-general could find. Had there been wisdom in these Indian councils it would have been felt that we ought to have nothing to do either with the dethroning or enthroning of these rulers. But in a most fatal hour it was decided to carry Shah Sujah back to Cabul, as the best means of barring the approaches to the Indus to Persians and Russians!

Our warlike preparations went on the while, but it was not until the 1st of October that his lordship issued his famous Simla proclamation. At this moment, if the Governor-General did not know that the siege of Herat, the first alleged great cause of our inquietude, had been raised, and the reduced Persian army forced into a disgraceful and ruinous retreat, he might at least have known that the young Shah had no chance of success, and that the British expedition sent to the Persian Gulf could not fail in its proposed object. Persia had derived nothing but disaster and shame from the rashly undertaken expedition, and ill and pusillanimously conducted siege. Lieutenant Eldred Pottinger, who threw himself into the

place, directed the defence. The ignorant besiegers could scarcely preserve so much as a blockade ; they knew nothing about regular approaches, and in all their attempts to storm they were beaten back. In one assault the Shah lost 1800 men in killed and wounded, and altogether his casualties exceeded 3000. He was as remote from his object in September, 1838, as in November, 1837, when he first came in sight of Herat. His army was short of provisions, and without clothing and pay ; and, rather than have continued through another winter before a fortress which had so repeatedly defeated them, the Persians would, in all likelihood, have dispersed themselves, in spite of all their Shah could do to retain them.*

Our expedition from Bombay landed at Karrack in the Persian Gulf, in the middle of June, when Macnaghten and Burnes were preparing for the Afghanistan war by negotiating with Runjeet Sing at Lahore. The possession of Karrack, an island belonging to Persia, and in the centre of the Shah's dominions, showed him how completely those dominions were within our grasp ; showed him that we could disembark any force we pleased at Bushire within a fortnight of its quitting Bombay, and possess ourselves of some of the chief towns of Persia before the people at large could be made aware that hostilities were intended. It had been pointed out by a foreign writer that if all the powers of the Russian empire were exerted in equipping an army for the invasion of India, and if that mighty army, overcoming obstacles that were scarcely to be overcome by an army of any size, reached the western borders of Beloochistan in safety with its complete materiel, a descent by the British on Bushire would put us in possession of all the communications of that army, compel Persia at her peril to act against it, and place the rear of that army and the line of its advance and relief completely at our mercy.† The

* Buist, 'Outline of the Operations of the British troops in Scinde and Affghanistan.'

† 'The British Empire in the East,' by Count Bjornstjerna, translated by H. Evans Lloyd. London, 1840.

descent on Karrack gave practical proof of the soundness of this speculation. Moreover, it had been shown pretty clearly that for Russia to send an army as far as the eastern border of Persia was *impossible*, and our own experience has now convinced the most sceptical that were the Russians *there*, the mountain tribes, without our intervention, would cut off their supplies, destroy their cattle, and seize their baggage. We could, any day, cut an expedition from the westward to pieces by landing a force at Bushire, where the coast country, with our commanding fleets and uninterrupted supplies, would furnish a base of operations from which Europe and Asia united together could not drive us. It has further been shown that a Russian army would take twice the time to march from their farthest to our nearest Indian frontier that the armies of England would occupy in being wafted from the banks of the Thames to the banks of the Indus ; and that, during the interval, our fleets might annihilate the navy of the Tzar, or blockade it, and render it utterly useless in the Baltic and in the Black Sea.* From the moment that our troops landed on his island of Karrack, the eyes of the Persian Shah were turned more anxiously in that direction than upon the siege of Herat ; and at the end of September, when he gave up that siege altogether, and put his diminished and rabble army in motion for a retreat into the heart of his own country, he declared that he did so in consequence of the presence of our armament, and that if Karrack had not been seized by us, Herat would have been taken by him. It is true that the possession of Karrack, and the descent we might so easily have effected on Bushire, were calculated to induce a rapid retreat, even if the Persians had been on the eve of victory and conquest : but it is not true that our menacing attitude at Karrack was the sole cause of the Shah's hasty retreat ; his army was not on the eve of victory, but on the very brink of dissolution. After many defeats, it was half famished and was wholly disheartened, and it could not by any possibility have continued its

* George Buist. 'Spectator' newspaper.

stupid operations round Herat through another winter, or so much as through another month.*

Well! Herat was safe; that key to the British dominions in India could not be given by Persia to Russia, for Persia could not get it. All the dispositions for a grand campaign beyond the Indus and in the heart of Afghanistan were made (badly enough, no doubt!), and marching orders were given; but it appears that not a single regiment had yet begun to march when Lord Auckland received official intelligence of the retreat of the Persians from Herat. But this intelligence had no apparent effect on the councils and conduct of men who had made up their minds for war, and who could not rest until the British flag should be carried over the snowy mountains and through the deep defiles of Afghanistan. These men did not see, or would not feel, what a perfect bulwark nature and fortune had opposed to the possibility of a successful invasion of British India from the westward, and that they were going to weaken by their aggression the most formidable portion of this bulwark. Long before the fearful catastrophe in which all this blindness, or rashness and obstinacy, ended, and while unthinking people were shouting for the victories our arms were obtaining, a sensible writer at home said: "We are making the false movement of a general who finding a broad marsh between himself and his opponent, wantonly crosses it with great loss and inconvenience, posts himself on the opposite margin, and, cutting himself off from his supplies, affords his opponent, at the first favourable moment, an opportunity of driving him into the swamp, or starving him to death, or compelling him to surrender at discretion. Such is a fair view of our present adventure, nor can we see any termination, utter discomfiture excepted, to the course into which it leads, until it brings us to the very thing we deprecate—contiguity and collision with the power of Russia in Persia."†

In the month of October, 1838, when Lord Auckland

* C. Mac Farlane, 'Our Indian Empire.'

† 'Spectator,' July 27, 1839.

issued his warlike proclamations at Simla, the army of India was raised to 203,000 men. Sir Henry Fane was at this time commander-in-chief of all India. He disapproved both of the principles of policy and of the arrangement of the details of the expedition ; and viewed with alarm the prospect of having our armies so far removed from our own frontier. Sir Henry was, besides, in indifferent health when the first campaign was announced. Colonel Fane, the son of Sir Henry Fane, said, after his father's death, " I am prepared to prove that the military head in India, and second member of council of that country, did oppose, or perhaps rather point out to the Governor-General, the extreme danger of this wild and unmeasured expedition. . . . He ensured Lord Auckland of the success which did at first appear to attend us, but warned him that to maintain large bodies of troops in countries so distant, and which scarce produced food sufficient for the scanty population, was next to impossible."*

As a foretaste of what might be expected from him, Runject Sing, in despite of a treaty which had been drawn up at Lahore by Macnaghten and Burnes, refused to allow our troops to cross his territories in the Punjab. Our principal rendezvous was therefore appointed to be Shikarpoor in Sindh. The Ameers of Sindh had faithfully promised to provide supplies and the means of conveyance for our armies ; but our commanders found that they had provided nothing but jealousy, hatred, and enmity, and that the mass of the Sindh population were eager to attack our troops. Sir Henry Fane, whose health was growing worse, resigned the command. Lord Auckland nominated Sir John Keane, a brave and experienced officer, but said to be headstrong, passionate, and domineering, to the direction of the whole force, and instructed him to send his own orders to Sir Willoughby Cotton, who, as senior officer, had succeeded to the command of the Bengal column as a temporary measure until its junction with the Bombay

* Letter published in the ' Times ' of 5th of June, 1842.

troops. This also gave the temporary command of a division to Major-General Nott, and of a brigade to Colonel Dennie. We can trace, even at this moment, some of the jealousies and heartburnings which helped to destroy the discipline of the whole army.

Sir Alexander Burnes (he had been made Knight Commander of the Bath and Lieutenant-Colonel for his previous services on the Indus, in Afghanistan, &c., and, perhaps, in part for his ample contribution to the unlucky scheme now in process of execution) had been employed to collect at Shikarpoor camels for the use of the whole army. The Governor-General had calculated that 45,000 camels might be obtained; but Burnes could never collect 20,000. Everywhere the forebodings of calamity thickened, and warned men—who would not be warned—to stop their advance and retrace their steps. There was no dependence to be placed either on the Ameers of Sind or upon the Lion of Lahore; there was little security for our communications and supplies; and such means as were adopted for the obtaining of some such security were inadequate to the end, were slovenly, unsystematic, unworthy of British officers at this time of day.

Numerous and unpardonable military errors were committed on the advance. The several divisions of the army were accompanied by an amazing number of camp followers, who could not shift for themselves in the countries beyond the Indus: thus provisions were made to run short even before our troops entered the mountain country. The camels died rapidly, the horses of our artillery were shot to prevent their falling into the hands of the enemy. The communications between the front and rear division—left one hundred miles apart—were completely cut off by the fierce tribes in the mountain pass. The robbers in the pass were incessantly harassing our soldiers, and pouncing down from their rocks and hills upon the baggage. Savage and unwise orders were carried into execution by our harassed and exasperated troops: whenever these Afghans were captured they were shot or hanged, *no quarter being on any occasion*

given to them. Shah Sujah, the dethroned sovereign, whom we were to substitute for Dost Mohamed, was allowed to put to death thirty-six out of thirty-eight captives he had made, and that, too, in the presence of at least one British field-officer, Major Mac Sherry. If the Afghans had concentrated their forces, and had acted under the command of any officer endowed with common sense, the progress of Sir John Keane must have been stopped before he got to Ghuznee. That last-named place was, however, stormed and taken, and the fall of Ghuznee opened the way to Cabul. As Sir John Keane drew nigh, Dost Mohamed quitted his throne and his capital, and fled with only 600 horsemen to seek a refuge in the wide, wild country beyond the Oxus. On the 7th August, 1839, Shah Sujah, Sir John Keane, the general officers of the army, Burnes, Macnaghten, and other officers of the mission, or of the staff, made a pompous and triumphant entrance into Cabul. Considering the work as done, Sir John Keane hurried back to India, and from India to England, to be raised to the peerage by the title of Baron Keane of Ghuznee and Cappaquin (with a pension of 2000*l.* a-year), and to receive the thanks of Parliament and of the Court of Directors. The shouts of triumph and applause were, however, mingled with the expression of many doubts and some severe criticism. In the Lords the Duke of Wellington said that he had never doubted but that the valour and discipline of our troops would secure victory to our arms in Afghanistan; but that it was when we had completed our first conquests that our difficulties would begin. Lord Ellenborough declared the war to have been a folly, and said it remained to be seen whether it might not prove a crime. Lord Auckland, as governor-general, received his meed: he was raised in the peerage to the rank of an earl: and the Court of Directors and the Court of Proprietors honoured him with their vote of thanks “for the sagacity and promptitude with which he had planned the expedition, and the zeal and vigour he had displayed in preparing the troops to take the field.” *

* C. Mac Farlane, ‘Our Indian Empire.’

Part of the army—the Bombay column—quitted Cabul on the 18th of September, and the Bengal troops were recalled in October. Independently of the Shah's contingent, paid and officered by the English, about 8000 men, British troops and Sepoys, were left in that cold and inhospitable country. Enormous errors were committed by Macnaghten and Burnes, who were left at Cabul, as envoy, and assistant to the envoy. Shah Sujah made bad worse by selecting a low-born, rapacious old scoundrel to be his prime minister. On the return of spring, the Ghilzies and other powerful tribes began to unite their cavalry and to attack our outposts. At the same time the people dwelling on the hills and in the glens not only refused to pay any taxes or tribute to Shah Sujah, but also refused to sell provisions to our commissariat. As the ice and snow melted, and left the roads and mountain tracks passable, a fierce war of posts commenced. Insurrections broke out among the tribes that inhabit the country to the east of the Bolan pass. At the same time some of the Ameers of Sind called their followers to the field, united their bands, and threatened all our communications between Afghanistan and the Punjaub. Several most serious disasters were sustained by our troops; and the brilliant capture of Khelat, and other achievements, could not disguise the fact that we had embarked in a ruinous contest.

Our army up the country was repeatedly reinforced. At the end of the year 1840, we had more than 16,000 men in Afghanistan; and at the first outbreak of the great insurrection in November, 1841, we had upwards of 14,000 men, besides the Shah's contingent. The number of our political agents, scattered all about the country, as if it were conquered and submissive, and to be organized, like annexed provinces in Hindustan, by means of the pen, exceeded thirty. All these men (and not a few of them appear to have been young and inexperienced) were paid large salaries by the Company. Sir William Macnaghten, as envoy and minister, had 11,220*l.* per annum; his assistant, Lieutenant-Colonel Sir Alexander Burnes, 3000*l.* Among them they received more money than could be realized by taxes and

duties in any one province of the Afghan empire. Every thing was on a prodigious scale of expense. It was costing us more than 3,000,000*l.* a-year to occupy a country for Shah Sujah which never could render him 300,000*l.* a-year. The Russomania had abated; we had obtained substantial proofs of the difficulty of any army traversing Afghanistan, even if it could get so far; and we ought by this time to have learned that the Afghan tribes were neither to be depended upon in their own country, nor to be feared by us behind the Indus: but there our army was left, without any adequate arrangement either for its victualling or for its safe return; and there our money continued to be lavished without any security for its repayment.*

A.D. 1841.—On the 26th of January parliament was opened by Her Majesty. The speech dwelt upon the affairs of the Levant (of which we shall presently give a continuous though necessarily brief narrative), on the gallantry and skill displayed by our naval forces on the coast of Syria, and on the struggle still going on in China. On the subject of the Afghan war not a word was said—an omission which was afterwards noticed by Sir Robert Peel. The address was agreed to without a division.

On the 4th of February a vote of thanks was given in the House of Lords to Admiral Stopford, Commodore Napier, and the captains and officers of the fleet under their command during the operations conducted on the coast of Syria, and particularly for the decisive attack on St. Jean d'Acre. The Duke of Wellington declared that he considered this achievement one of the greatest of modern times. On the following day a similar vote of thanks passed the House of Commons.

The ministry, however, seemed to be weaker than before, and unable to carry any important legislative measure. After very long and angry debates on a bill for the Registration of Voters in Ireland, they were outvoted by a majority of 11; and then Lord John Russell

* Buist, and MS. Journal of a young officer on the Bombay establishment.

threw up the bill. This was taken as a striking illustration of the decline and approaching downfall of the Whig administration.

Mr. Divett, one of the members for Exeter, brought in a bill for removing the Jews' civil disabilities. It was opposed on the second reading by Sir R. Inglis, who protested against surrendering that principle of the constitution by which magistrates had hitherto been confined to persons professing Christianity. He was answered by Lord John Russell, who supported the bill, and declared his readiness to go farther, and admit Jews to seats in parliament. The bill was carried through the Commons, but rejected by the Lords.

After wearying debates on the quarrels of the Kirk of Scotland, on the Catholic college of Maynooth, and on church-rates, Mr. Ewart moved for the appointment of a minister of public education. The honourable member wished that such minister should be a member of the House of Commons, and should annually lay before it a statement of the condition and prospects of the education of the people. A minister of public instruction was to be found in almost every foreign kingdom, who regularly made such reports to the Crown. Such a minister ought to mix and associate with the educational institutions of the country, but by no means to control them. He regretted the niggardliness of the grant now made by the State for education, amounting to only 30,000*l.* a-year; and called on the House to be more liberal.

Ministers opposed the whole motion, not, they said, because they objected to its principle, but on account of the difficulties attendant on its execution. They promised soon to lay before the House, for the Education Committee of the Privy Council, information which they thought would go far to fulfil, for this year, the object of the motion. Mr. Ewart acceded, and the motion was withdrawn.

A farther mitigation of the criminal code was carried in the course of the session.

The state of the finances was still very unsatisfactory; and the chancellor of the exchequer, who had erred in

his calculations the preceding year, was compelled to acknowledge a deficiency of nearly two millions. The expenditure had amounted to 49,285,000*l.*; the income had only reached the sum of 47,443,000*l.* To make up this deficiency Mr. Baring proposed extensive alterations in our timber and sugar duties, not in the way of augmentation, but in that of reduction on timber and sugar imported from other countries or from colonies not our own. He calculated on a vast increase of consumption, on the benefits derivable from making England the one great mart and depôt for sugars, &c., and on the chance of the countries on the Baltic taking more of our manufactures if we took more of their timber, and reduced the amount of protection we gave to Canada timber. The chancellor of the exchequer also suggested the expediency of altering the Corn Laws, as another sure means of increasing the revenue.

It was not until they were on their last legs that ministers fairly took up the Corn Law question. It was not long since Lord Melbourne, the premier, had solemnly declared that he would not agitate the question—that he did not think that the advantages to be gained by the change were worth the evils of the struggle—that the Corn Laws could not be altered without a most violent struggle; without causing much ill blood and a deep sense of grievance. But the country was now nearly as much agitated for the repeal of the Corn Laws as it had been a few years ago for the passing of the Reform Bill; and the cabinet saw no other chance of recovering their popularity and making up the deficient revenue than in altering the Corn Laws together with the timber and sugar duties. But they found themselves unable to carry any of their proposed measures. On the sugar duties they were outvoted by a majority of 36, there being for the motion 281, and against it 317.

Hereupon it was fully expected that ministers would resign. Great, therefore, was the surprise when, on the following day, the chancellor of the exchequer rose in his place, as if nothing had occurred, and gave notice that,

on the Monday following, he would move *the usual annual sugar duties*. Lord Darlington said that "it was plain that ministers meant to stay in office with a tenacity—he must be allowed to say—unparalleled in the history of governments, and with the deliberate decision of the House of Commons unequivocally declared against them."

A few days after this Sir Robert Peel moved a resolution of want of confidence in the government, and carried it by 312 against 311. But still these most tenacious of Whigs would not resign. They would first try the effects of a dissolution of parliament, hoping to gain an augmentation of force through the anti-Corn-Law agitators. On the 22nd of June, parliament was prorogued by the queen in person; and on the following day it was dissolved by proclamation.

The new parliament was opened by commission on the 19th of August. Many objections were taken to the royal speech, which was read on the 24th. The Earl of Ripon moved a vote of want of confidence, proposing to represent to her majesty that the public expenditure had for several successive years exceeded the annual income, and that the House of Lords were convinced of the necessity of adopting measures for the remedy of so great an evil, &c. He was warmly supported by the Duke of Wellington, who delivered a short speech condemnatory of the conduct of ministers as well abroad as at home. Ministers were here left with a majority of 72 against them.

In the Commons, after four nights of stormy debate, Lord John Russell found that he was out-voted by 91. At last, on the 30th of August, Lord Melbourne announced that his cabinet was no more.

Sir Robert Peel as premier, and the Duke of Wellington, speedily formed a new cabinet. Lord Lyndhurst became lord chancellor, Mr. Goulburn chancellor of the exchequer, Lord Wharncliffe president of the council, the Duke of Buckingham privy seal, Sir James Graham home secretary, the Earl of Aberdeen foreign secretary, Lord Stanley colonial secretary, the Earl of Haddington

first lord of the Admiralty, Lord Ellenborough president of the Board of Control, the Earl of Ripon president of the Board of Trade, Sir Henry Hardinge secretary at war, and Sir Edward Knatchbull treasurer of the navy and paymaster of the forces. These formed the cabinet. Among the appointments, without seats in the cabinet, were those of Lord Lowther, postmaster-general, Sir George Murray, master-general of the ordnance, Lord Canning under foreign secretary, Sir F. Pollock attorney-general, Sir W. Follett solicitor-general, and Sir Charles Bagot governor-general of Canada. A change, as extensive as any that had been usual, was made in the queen's household. Earl de Grey became lord-lieutenant of Ireland.

The re-elections of the members of the new government by their respective constituencies having taken place without the loss of a single seat, the House of Commons reassembled on the 16th of September. The Whigs, who were now sitting on the opposition benches, attempted to bewilder Sir Robert Peel by a multiplicity of questions, and to force from him a premature disclosure of his intentions respecting the revenue, the corn laws, &c. The premier kept his own counsel until his own proper moment arrived. He had distinctly stated, at the close of the last session, that if called to power, he would not bring forward any premature declarations as to the intentions of her majesty's government. This declaration he had made repeatedly, and the sense of the country had been taken at the general election under the distinct announcement that such was his intention. Moreover, the season was far advanced, and the House was thinning. Meeting the difficulty boldly in the face, and finding that the deficiency was even greater than had been believed, he demanded and obtained an addition to the ways and means of 2,467,432*l*. So soon as the business of immediate urgency was dispatched the parliament was prorogued by commission. This was on the 7th of October.

While the Whigs were sustaining the discomfitures *which* drove them from office, the sad effects of their

policy beyond the Indus were becoming more and more apparent; and before the close of this year the Afghan tragedy was completed.

As early as the month of May, 1841, Major Pottinger prognosticated the coming storm, representing to Macnaghten the envoy the insufficiency of our military force in some places, and the badness of their cantonments in nearly all places. The major was looked upon as an alarmist. Sir A. Burnes was quite confident there was no danger. At the end of October, Cabul was surrounded by predatory bands, and our communication with Hindustan was cut off. In October, General Sale cleared the pass of Khoord Cabul, but not without hard fighting and considerable loss. Yet all through that month our officers were insulted in their cantonments at Cabul, and many attempts were made to assassinate them. On the 2nd of November, an attack was made on the house of Sir A. Burnes in the city; and that rash man was massacred, together with his brother, Lieutenant Burnes, Lieutenant W. Broadfoot, and every man, woman, and child, found on the premises. Sir William Macnaghten, who was in the cantonments, thought and said the storm would soon blow over of itself. Instead of blowing over, it increased in violence. Every minute that was lost in inaction raised the numbers and the audacity of the insurgents. The chief command of our astounded and bewildered army (bewildered much more by the inactivity and stupor of their leaders than by the proceedings of the Afghans) was at this time held by Major-General Elphinstone, a most amiable and at one time a gallant officer, but who had been suffering a long and painful illness, which had affected his nerves, and worn out his mind as much as his body. He was utterly incapable of acting in this sudden emergency with the promptitude and vigour necessary for the preservation of his troops, and the officers next in command under him seem to have been—without the same physical and unavoidable causes—as incapable as himself, and to have shrunk from all responsibility. The cantonment occupied by the army for so many months was as bad as bad

could be, and the magazine of provisions was placed in the most exposed and least defensible part of it, detached from our works of strength. All the calamities which befell our ill-starred force might be traced more or less to the defects of our position; and whether we look to its situation or to its construction, this cantonment at Cabul must ever be spoken of as a disgrace to our military skill and judgment.*

On the 3rd of November, the day after the outbreak in Cabul, 3000 savage Ghilzees rushed towards our cantonments, and other numerous bands began to collect on the surrounding hills. We turn with shame from the details of the fearful humiliating story. Our commanding officers continued in their imbecility until our troops were infected with downright cowardice.

On the 4th of November our people ran away from the commissariat fort, abandoning to the enemy all our stores, clothing, and provisions, except two days' supply of provisions in cantonments. On the 9th, General Elphinstone's weak state of health induced him to give up the command to Brigadier Shelton. A quarrel or wide difference of opinion immediately arose between Shelton and Macnaghten. How provisions had been obtained we know not; but our army was still motionless in its cantonments on the 22nd of November, when the terrible Akbar Khan arrived at Cabul with some hundreds of well-mounted warriors. Shelton made a sally, committed no fewer than six capital military errors, and was beaten back with loss. On the 26th it was proposed by the enemy that the British should quietly evacuate the country, and leave the Afghans to themselves. On the 8th of December, Macnaghten requested General Elphinstone to state whether the only alternative left was not to negotiate for our safe retreat. The despondent dying Elphinstone gave a fatal response in the affirmative. On the 11th of December, Macnaghten went out to meet

* Lieutenant Vincent Eyre. The cantonment had a low rampart and a narrow ditch; its form was a parallelogram; it had round flanking bastions at each corner, but every one of these bastions was commanded by some fort or hill.

Akbar Khan and certain great khans and heads of tribes, who had intimated that they were desirous of concluding a treaty. A treaty or an agreement was concluded—our troops were to be allowed to retire without molestation; the Afghans were to furnish them with provisions and the means of transport for the conveyance of our baggage, stores, &c. Instead of sending provisions, the savages murdered all our sick and wounded men that they could lay their hands upon.

On the 14th of December was commenced the most disastrous and appalling retreat that has ever been recorded in authentic history. Making allowance for the difference of numbers, the retreat of the French from Moscow was less dreadful than this. In both cases, the ice and snow, and nakedness and famine, slew more than the sword. On the 20th of December Sir William Macnaghten had an interview with the chiefs, who now demanded that a portion of our guns and ammunition should be given up, and that Brigadier Shelton should be put into their hands as an hostage. Lieutenant Sturt, in whom the English spirit had not become extinct, proposed to the general to break off the treaty and march forthwith to Jellalabad, where Sale was stoutly maintaining himself. But the general called a council of war—and a council of war never fights. On the 22nd of December, as our troops were preparing to follow the van-division, Akbar Khan sent to propose a new and much more favourable treaty than the one which he had already broken, and to invite our envoy to another conference. On the following day Macnaghten went to the place appointed,—presented Akbar with a beautiful Arab horse, and was barbarously murdered under the eyes of that khan and of other chiefs. It is even said that Akbar himself did the foul deed, shooting his victim through the body with a richly-mounted pistol which Macnaghten had sent him only a few hours before. The body was hacked to pieces by the armed fanatics, who carried the head into the city and triumphantly exhibited it to Captain Conolly, one of the prisoners who had been taken. Not an arm was raised to avenge Macnaghten's

fate—nothing could re-animate our troops, or the wretched men who commanded them. All went on as if with one accord to complete their disgrace and seal their doom—all, except a few English hearts who murmured and remonstrated, but who had not moral courage sufficient to incur the heavy and awful responsibility of putting their commanding officers under arrest, appealing to the troops, and assuming the command themselves. There were more councils of war called, to end in more baseness and madness: it was agreed to leave behind all our guns, except six; to give up all our treasure; to give up married men, with their wives and families, as hostages; to pay Osman Khan, and some other treacherous villains, five lacs of rupees in bills drawn upon India, but negotiated on the spot by a merchant of Cashmere and some Hindu bankers, the said Osman Khan engaging to escort the whole army in safety to Peshawer. In vain did Major Pottinger raise his manly voice against this useless debasement (and never were English soldiers so debased before as to buy a way out of an enemy's country!)—the rest of the officers composing the council declared, one and all, that the bargain must be struck. And, accordingly, the bills were given, and English ladies were delivered over as hostages, if not at this moment a little later.

On the 6th of January, 1842, our head-quarters and the rest of our army cleared out of the cantonments at Cabul, to march, in the depth of winter, through a country of perhaps unparalleled difficulty. The strength of our whole force was at this time estimated at about 4500 fighting men; the camp-followers at a moderate computation amounted to about 12,000 men, besides women and children. At the moment the rear-guard cleared out of the cantonments, the Afghans began to plunder the baggage, and to follow and fire upon our soldiers; and these operations can scarcely be said to have ceased until there was nothing left to plunder—or to kill. We will not follow this demoralized and degraded army through the horrors of the passes of Khoord Cabul, Tezeen, and Gundamuck. General Elphinstone,

almost at the point of death, gave himself up to one of the Khans. The ladies and wounded were given up; Dr. Brydon, who escaped by a miracle, was the only officer that reached the garrison of Jellalabad in safety, and a mere handful of sepoy and camp-followers entered the fortress, which Sale had held in spite of General Elphinstone's insane orders to him to evacuate. Counting camp-followers, women, and children, more than 26,000 human beings had perished in the retreat, through cold, famine, and the incessant attacks of a most faithless and ferocious enemy. A few hundreds—mostly native Indians—had been carried away captives, to be turned into slaves or to be kept for the sake of ransoms. Woe to this Afghan war! and mercy to the souls of those who planned it, and who nearly all perished in it!*

The upholding of the Ottoman Empire and the settlement of the Levant which was effected during this year, and while the Melbourne administration was yet in power, seems to us worthy of all praise and commendation. The war which was waged for these great objects was indisputably a war for the benefit of humanity. It cost but little bloodshed, and it gave back to the Sultan the strength of which his rebel vassal the Pasha of Egypt ought never to have been allowed to deprive him.

In the month of May, 1829, Sultan Mahmoud sent Hafiz Pasha across the Euphrates, with an army to recover Syria. In the month of June of that year, Hafiz Pasha was thoroughly defeated by Ibrahim Pasha, who drove the Osmanlys to the other side of the Euphrates. On the 27th of June, Sultan Mahmoud died, and was succeeded by his son Abdul Medjid, who was only in his sixteenth year.

Anxious for peace, Abdul Medjid offered the too-powerful Pasha a full pardon for the past, and the hereditary sovereignty of Egypt; Mehemet Ali replied, that he must have Syria as well. At first, France would have put herself forward as sole mediatrix in the quarrel; but this was a position which the other powers of Europe

could not allow her to occupy. For views connected with her own aggrandisement, France wished Mehemet Ali to have and keep for the present all that he coveted. After pretending, for a time, to go along with Lord Palmerston, the French minister suddenly veered about—he could not coincide with us and the other powers—that he could have no part in the settlement of the Levant, as we pretended to settle it. Acting with admirable boldness and decision, Lord Palmerston then said the Levant should be settled without France. Upon this announcement there was much flustering and blustering among the journalists on the other side of the channel—but what could France now do against the allied powers of England, Austria, Russia, and Prussia? All that she or her consular and more private agents did, was to give false hopes to the Pasha of Egypt and Ibrahim Pasha, and to encourage them into a resistance which was utterly unavailing, and which cost them great sacrifices.

A few weeks after the death of Sultan Mahmoud, the Turkish fleet, under the command of a traitorous capitan pasha, or lord high admiral, sailed through the Dardanelles, went down to Alexandria, and there placed itself at the disposal of Mehemet Ali. The young Sultan had, therefore, no available naval force at the time when he most wanted it. It was resolved that the British navy should make up this deficiency. Nearly at the same time formidable insurrections broke out among the mountaineers in Syria against the army and oppressive government of the Pasha of Egypt. They complained of the conscription, which dragged them away in chains to fight for Mehemet Ali—they complained of *corvées*, and all manner of forced labour—they complained of the enormous taxes imposed upon property on the death of the owner, and the succession of his heir or heirs—and they could not brook the law which commanded every man among them who was not a soldier in the pasha's service to deliver up his arms.

The treaty between England, Austria, Russia, and Turkey, for the settlement of the Eastern question was signed

at London, on the 15th of July, 1840, and was ratified on the 15th of September. By the beginning of October our fleet, very effectually aided by a naval and land force of the Emperor of Austria, reduced the important city of Beyrout, on the Syrian coast, drove off Ibrahim Pasha with a loss of 7000 men in killed, wounded, and prisoners, and with a sacrifice of nearly all his artillery and stores. Encouragement and substantial assistance were sent to the Syrian mountaineers; and the Egyptian army was compelled to retreat on Acre. Sidon was captured by the allies. The insurrection against Mehemet Ali spread over all Syria; and Emir Beschir, chief of the Druses of Mount Lebanon, placed himself in the hands of the allies. On the 3rd of November the decisive blow was struck: Acre, or St. Jean d'Acre, was bombarded by the British fleet, and in less than four hours was knocked to pieces; the Egyptians losing more than 2000 men in killed and wounded, and 300 as prisoners; whilst the British counted only 12 killed and 42 wounded. The remnant of the army of Mehemet Ali then evacuated Syria. On the 27th of November, 1840, Mehemet Ali, seeing no prospect of French assistance, and yielding to hard necessity, accepted the terms offered him by the allies, through Commodore Sir Charles Napier, and agreed to restore the Turkish fleet to the Sultan, to renounce for ever all claims upon Syria, and to rest satisfied with the possession of Egypt as an hereditary fief of the Sublime Porte. Thus speedily was settled one of the most important questions of modern times; and thus was given strength and solidity to the shattered Ottoman empire, together with another chance of occupying the position among the first-rate powers which, for the sake of the peace of all Europe she ought to hold. And, since that period the internal improvements of this empire has gone on at an accelerated pace.

A.D. 1842. There had been some slight change in the cabinet. Lord Ellenborough, fortunately for the service, and for the tarnished honour of our arms, had been sent out to India as Governor-General; and he had been succeeded at the Board of Control by Lord Fitz-

gerald and Vesci. The Duke of Buckingham, who, as Marquess of Chandos, had so long headed what was called the farming interest, had resigned the privy seal, being alienated from Sir Robert Peel by the intimations now given that the corn laws must and would be changed. His office had been taken by the Duke of Buccleuch.

The session of parliament was opened on the 3rd of February. The addresses were carried without a division. When divisions became necessary, it was seen that the ministry was strong enough to carry any such measure of reform as it might propose. The machine of government was no longer dead-locked. Sir Robert boldly brought forward and carried his property and income-tax, reducing at the same time various other taxes and duties. There was no other certain mode of raising revenue sufficient to make up for past deficiencies and defray our annual expenditure. Upon more than 750 articles there was an abatement of duty. Immense strides were made towards the system of free trade. For the total abolition of the Corn Laws Sir Robert was not yet prepared: he still clung to the sliding scale; but his grasp was evidently less tenacious than formerly; and instead of a sudden alteration which took place on the existing scale from 10s. to 6s. 8d., 2s. 8d., and 1s., he proposed two stationary points, after which the duty would only fall by 1s. at each increase of 1s. in the average price. He believed that agricultural industry would repose on a firmer basis with prices between 54s. and 58s. the quarter, than when it was disturbed by violent fluctuations. He, however, disclaimed the idea that the legislature could guarantee any price for corn whatever. Another material part of the modification was the addition of 156 towns to the list of 150 in which the average prices of corn had been previously taken. Mr. Cobden denounced the plan of the government as an insult to a suffering people. This honourable member could consistently be violent, for he had been for years an enthusiast, a lecturer, and propagandist for a free trade in corn; and for some time he had devoted his entire life to this one object. But when the late Whig ministers,

who had only taken up the Corn Law question when it was considerably past the eleventh hour, raised a clamour against Sir Robert Peel as loud as that of Mr. Cobden, it did seem inconsistent, untair, and indelicate. And even now the Whig party were far from recognizing the principle of a free trade in corn. Lord John Russell moved a fixed duty of 8s. the quarter : Sir Robert Peel said that this was too high ; and Lord John was outvoted by 349 against 226. Mr. Villiers, whose views on the Corn Laws had long differed from those entertained by the Melbourne cabinet, did indeed vote for the abolition of all duties payable on the importation of foreign corn. He was outvoted by 303 to 90 ; and nearly all the Whigs were found in the majority. Sir Robert Peel's scale was carried by 306 against 104. On the 11th March the premier developed his financial plans in a long and most able speech, which gave satisfaction to practical commercial men, and to all those whose habits and pursuits gave them the best means of judging of such matters.

On the 2nd of May Mr. Thomas Duncombe presented to the Commons what was facetiously called "The People's Petition ;" which was said to have been signed by nearly three millions and a half of people. We had had monster meetings and monster balloons—here was a monster petition ! when tacked together it required sixteen men to carry it ! it was escorted to Palace-yard by a long procession of working men, who marched in good order and with peaceable demeanour to the houses of parliament. It was so big that the door of the House of Commons was not wide enough to admit it. It was therefore divided into sections, and in that manner carried by the petitioners into the body of the House, where it was left to lie on the floor, for no table could have held it. There was much laughter, and those laughed most who best knew how the signatures had been obtained or manufactured. It demanded the enactment of the six points constituting "The People's Charter." Mr. Duncombe, though he laughed with those who laughed, moved that the petitioners, by their agents or counsel, should be heard at the bar. He found 49 members

to vote with him ; but there were 287 against him. The best of the reformers—as Mr. Benjamin Hawes—said they could never think of conceding power to masses of men, blindly led, who had signed this trashy petition.

Sir Robert Peel announced that a supplementary grant of 10,000*l.* would be proposed in addition to the usual education grant of 30,000*l.* On the 9th of August Sir Robert Peel moved an address for the erection of monuments to Sir Sidney Smith, Lord de Saumarez, and Lord Exmouth, three of our greatest naval heroes ; and Mr. Hawes withdrew a motion for adding the names of Herschel, Watt, and Davy, hoping that Sir Robert himself would undertake that duty. The parliament was prorogued on the 12th of August, when her majesty deeply lamented the military reverses to the westward of the Indus, but turned with satisfaction to the gallant defence of Jellalabad, and a decisive victory in the field which had evidently proved the courage and discipline of the European and native troops, and the skill and fortitude of their distinguished commander.

Lord Ellenborough arrived in India on the 28th of February, 1842. His earliest attention was claimed by the state of affairs on the Indus, where the Ameers of Sindé continued in a doubtful attitude, and by the state of affairs in Afghanistan, where our troops were remaining in a state of uncertainty as to their future operations, and where our captives were putting up earnest, but, at times, almost hopeless prayers for their liberation—a liberation which even the women of the party seem to have thought was not to be obtained by negotiation and ransom, but by hard fighting. At first his lordship adopted the notion of his predecessor ; and it is said that positive orders were more than once drawn up for withdrawing all our troops, and commencing a treaty with men whom no treaty could bind. But the clear head and high heart of the Duke of Wellington revolted at this line of policy ; and the English people, and assuredly the majority of the cabinet, felt with the duke. The indignation of the country would have broken up the new ministry if Lord Ellenborough had followed the plan which he had been

induced to entertain, momentarily and reluctantly, by the advice of others, whose seat of sensibility was mostly in the purse. In a happy moment, his lordship in council pronounced the word "Forward;" and from that moment our prestige began to brighten, our disgrace to be remedied. We speak not of vengeance for the past; this was not, and never ought to have been, a war of retaliation and revenge; it was a war of retrieval, a war of liberation—it was a war for retrieving all that was most valuable to us, our national character, the honour of our arms, and the spell of our prestige, wanting which we should have had not one, but many wars to undertake in the East:—it was a war for releasing in the only becoming manner the sons and daughters of Britain from a foul Afghan imprisonment.

In the meanwhile Sale, in spite of doubt and uncertainty as to the orders he might receive, and in spite of many other discouraging circumstances, had continued to hold out manfully behind the shattered walls of Jellalabad. His sorties had continued to be frequent and successful. Through these sorties many of Akbar Khan's people were killed and wounded, while many were so disheartened that they quitted the camp and turned their faces towards their own homes. On the morning of the 7th of April, Sale defeated Akbar Khan in the open field, with only a part of the troops that chief boasted he had been blockading. The defeat was signal: two Afghan standards, four guns which had been lost by our Cabul army, and nearly all Akbar Khan's ordnance, stores, tents, &c., were taken. Next to Sale himself, the heroes of this day were Lieutenant-Colonel Dennie, Colonel Monteith, Captains Broadfoot, Fenwick, Pattison, Oldfield, and Havelock, and Lieutenant Mayne. Unhappily the gallant Dennie was killed. But notwithstanding this victory the situation of the brigade was still very precarious, for the provisions were almost all consumed. At last, on Friday the 15th of April, Sale received the joyful intelligence that Pollock's camp was at Ali Boghan, only eight miles from Jellalabad, and that he would certainly be at Jellalabad in the course of the

next morning. And accordingly, on Saturday morning, at about eight o'clock, General Pollock and his force arrived, under a salute of seventeen guns. On Sunday, the day after this opportune arrival, there were three distinct shocks of earthquake; but they did no harm, and passed almost unnoticed by our rejoicing soldiers. Pollock had soundly beaten the Afghans in the Khyber Pass and above it; and before he reached Jellalabad, the beleaguered army had dissolved, or was in rapid flight, although only a few days before the Afghans, to deceive and distress some of their English captives, had been waving their hands and shouting "Shabash (Bravo)! All is over. The Feringee army has been cut up in the Khyber Pass, and all their guns taken, by Sultan Jan!"

As soon as it was known that General Pollock intended to advance and not to retreat, the people of Cabul began to desert the city in great numbers, from dread of our army; and all efforts to induce the people to meet and oppose Pollock on his march were found to be fruitless. Many of the khans either struck away for their own mountains, or agreed that some one or two of the English prisoners should be released, in order to open friendly negotiations with the victorious general. Just at this crisis Major-General Elphinstone breathed his last. By this time several of the Afghan chiefs were waging war upon one another in the neighbourhood of Cabul. It was difficult even with the best management to occupy the country—but happily there was no longer any intention of so doing—it was easy to regain possession of Cabul and to scatter the divided, distracted army of such an anarchic people. The sirdar now offered to release the English ladies and children unconditionally; but his dispatch was intercepted and destroyed by one of the khans. One security for the lives at least of these interesting prisoners was in the circumstance that the women and children of Akbar's own family and some other chiefs were in our hands; and the barbarians thought that if they murdered their captives, we should retaliate *by murdering ours*. The Shah Sujah was treacherously

assassinated by one Sujah Dowlah, "a handsome, quiet-looking man," who now tried hard to persuade the English prisoners that the Shah had played us false, and that he had committed a praiseworthy act in getting rid of him. The assassin's real motive was to avenge an attempt which had been made upon the life of Akbar by an agent of Shah Sujah; but many of these Afghan chiefs had become wonderfully anxious to prove that they had always been the friends of the English, and that it was the late Shah who made the insurrection, and called upon all the mountain tribes to destroy our army on its retreat through the passes. Shah Sujah's youngest son, Futtu Jung, was proclaimed king by one party, while the Barukzies formed another party and opposed him. From the close neighbourhood of Cabul, the civil or clan warfare was carried into the very heart of that city; and Futtu Jung, who hoped to retain the treasure, if not the throne, of his father, the murdered Shah, was closely besieged in the Balla Hissar. On the 6th of June, a mine was sprung under one of the towers of the Balla Hissar; but the storming party was driven back with loss. On the following day, however, Futtu Jung, finding his people disinclined to support him any longer, made terms with Akbar and the other chiefs, giving up a tower in the Balla Hissar to each of them, and retaining for himself possession of the royal residence. By this strange bargain, the citadel was now divided between four rival tribes, the Dooranees, the Barukzies, the Ghilzies, and the Kuzzilbashes, each being represented by its chief.

On the 2nd of June news was brought to Cabul that General Nott had gained a great victory under the walls of Candahar, and had killed 2000 of the Afghans. Nott also succeeded in seizing the person of Sufter Jung, a rebel son of Shah Sujah, who had fought against his own father, and had now been fighting against the English. The Sirdar Akbar Khan now told the English prisoners at Cabul that he intended shortly to march to Jellalabad, in order to pay his respects to General Pollock! But from other quarters the Englishmen heard that he medi-



tated carrying them all off to the banks of the Oxus. This was the man who, after concluding the treaty with Macnaghten, put on his boots and spurs on the morning of the departure of our army from Cabul, and told the assembled chiefs he was going to slay all the Feringee dogs; and this was the man who, on the passage of our troops through the Khoord Cabul Pass, followed with some chiefs in the rear, and in the same breath called to the Afghans in Persian (a language which many of our officers and people understood) to desist from firing, and in *Pushtoo* (a dialect of the country which none of our people understood) to continue firing at the infidel dogs. On the 29th of June there was a shock of an earthquake at Cabul, and Futty Jung, the Dooraunee chief, and youngest son of Shah Sujah, was proclaimed king by Akbar, who contented himself for the present with the title of vizier. But it should appear that our Indian government had begun once more to lose heart and confidence, and to doubt whether the united forces should retire at once to the country below the Khyber Pass, or take a forward position near Jellalabad, or advance upon Cabul. After his junction with Sale, Pollock halted more than four months at Jellalabad. During this long time the troops at Jellalabad were much afflicted with dysentery and other sicknesses, arising chiefly from bad food, improper or inadequate clothing, and the want of tents. A great many died, and all the surviving soldiers were impatient to quit the place, and march forward for the Afghan capital. If this long delay was partly owing to the difficulty of procuring cattle and forwarding supplies and reinforcements, it is pretty clear that it was partly owing to the indecision of government, and to the want of proper energy and ability in the commissariat, and (*perhaps*) in some other branches of the service. At length, about the middle of July, General Pollock received instructions to advance on Cabul as quick as possible. Pollock, however, could not, or at least did not, move until the 20th of August. Akbar Khan declared, with an expression of savage determination in his countenance, that

so surely as Pollock advanced, he would take all his English prisoners into Toorkistan, and make presents of them to the different chiefs of that wild country. On the 15th of August General Nott, at the head of about 7000 men, had left Candahar for Ghuznee and Cabul, a distance of about 300 miles. Sultan Jan started to meet Nott before he should reach Ghuznee; he fancied he was going to a certain victory, but he sustained a complete defeat; and, Ghuznee being retaken, Nott continued his advance. General Pollock was equally successful; and both armies were satisfactorily proving that our soldiers, both native and European, only required proper commanders to be invincible. It was now expected that General Nott would reach Cabul early in September, and that Pollock would be only a few days after him.

On the 25th of August, Akbar kept his threat by hurrying off his prisoners towards Toorkistan. On the 3rd of September, the unhappy party reached Bamecan, every indignity having been heaped upon them by the way. There they were halted under a fort until fresh orders should be received from the terrible Akbar. On the 11th, the khan who had charge of them, and who was "a man that would do anything for money," signed an agreement with five English officers, who promised to give him 20,000 rupees and to ensure him 1000 rupees per month. After this the khan hoisted the flag of defiance on the walls of the fort, telling the prisoners that they had no longer anything to fear—that they should not be carried into Toorkistan—that they should remain where they were until General Pollock should send a detachment to convey them back to Cabul in honour and safety. He had told the prisoners that he had received Akbar's orders to hurry them on their journey, and to butcher all the sick, and all those for whom there was no conveyance. Several neighbouring chiefs, knowing how matters were going at Cabul, and hoping to obtain some English money, came over to the fort and tendered their allegiance to Major Pottinger. Some two or three of them with much form and cere-

mony swore on the Koran to be faithful to Major Pottinger and his companions, who appointed a commissariat officer, and resolved, in case Akbar should send troops against them, to hold out till they should receive assistance, even though they should be reduced to eat the rats and mice, of which they had a grand stock in the old fort. On the 15th a letter was received at the fort, stating that all Cabul had risen against Akbar the new vizier; that Nott's and Pollock's forces were coming up rapidly; that Akbar had fled to the Zoba mountains, and that other chiefs who dreaded alike the vengeance of the English soldiers and the vengeance of the people of Cabul had fled in various directions, and with only a few followers. It was also reported that a light English force had been sent to their aid, and was making forced marches towards the fort. Upon this Major Pottinger, no longer a prisoner, but acting as a viceroy and making grants of land and assigning revenues to the hill chiefs, to keep them in good humour, determined to quit the old fort, and return with the whole party along the road leading to Cabul. The party, attended by a number of chiefs, set out from the fort on the 16th, hoping to meet their English friends on the road, and at the same time fearing that they might encounter some of Akbar's desperate and vindictive people. As they encamped for the first evening they received a letter stating that Pollock's force, after fighting from midday to midnight, had eventually forced the Khoord Cabul Pass, and had charged the enemy as far as the hills on the north side of the city of Cabul; that Nott had attacked and pursued them in another direction; that the late Kuzzilbashes and adherents of the late Shah Sujah had made themselves complete masters of the city, and that Akbar Khan, Sultan Jan Achmed Khan, and other hostile khans, who had all been defeated, were nowhere to be heard of. This was pleasant news; but at the same time our returning prisoners were alarmed by the report that 2000 horse were following them up to recapture them and to carry them into the deserts beyond the Oxus. *But their last fears were soon removed: at two o'clock*

in the morning of the 17th they were roused from their slumber by the arrival of a horseman with a letter from Sir Richmond Shakespear, who was coming with 600 mounted Kuzzilbashes to meet them. The party set off early, and at midday reached some deserted forts at the foot of a mountain-pass. They were sitting under the walls of one of three forts, sheltering themselves from the sun, when, at three o'clock, Sir Richmond arrived, and was received with heartfelt pleasure. "That we should have escaped unhurt, with so many delicate women, young children, and tender infants, through such numerous perils, fatigues, and privations, and, above all, from the hands of such merciless enemies as Akbar Khan and his Ghilzee confederates, seemed at first too much for the senses to realize, nor could even the most thoughtless among us fail to recognise and acknowledge in all that had befallen us the distinguishing grace and protecting providence of a forbearing and merciful God. We now for the first time learned that General Pollock had reached Cabul on the 15th, where one of his first acts had been to hasten the departure of the Kuzzilbashes to our aid by a donation of 10,000 rupees." But the party had still a long march and a difficult country between them and Cabul, and were not without their apprehensions that Akbar might make some desperate effort to recover his lost prey. Sir R. Shakespear forwarded an earnest request to General Pollock that more troops might instantly be sent out to their support, as the pass of Suffed Khak, through which they must march, was reported to be occupied by a band of marauders. At the same time it was determined that the party should move forward by forced marches, for which every facility was afforded by the Kuzzilbash chiefs in supplying them with fresh horses. On the dawn of the 18th the march was resumed. On the 20th they met an English officer, who gave them the welcome intelligence that General Sale's brigade was only a few miles distant on the road to meet them. A little farther on they saw a body of her majesty's 3rd dragoons with a squadron of Bengal cavalry quietly picketed in some fields.

“ All doubt was now at an end ; we were once more under the safeguard of the British troops. General Sale was there in person ; and his happiness at regaining his long-lost wife and daughter may be imagined. The gallant veteran’s countenance was an index of his feelings ; and apathetic indeed must have been the heart that failed to sympathize with his holy joy. The camp was still a few miles further on ; and we performed a procession of glad spirits, as we moved along towards the pass of Suffed Khak, whose heights we could discern crowned with British bayonets. This we found to be a part of the brave 13th light infantry (Sale’s own regiment), who, as the ladies successively ascended the hill raised three hearty cheers to each of them ; sounds never to be forgotten, producing a thrill of ecstasy through the whole frame. The mountain guns, under Captain Backhouse, would cap the scene with a royal salute.”* It was a glorious rescue—it was a scene worthy of an epic ; but alas ! that the number of the rescued should be so small. On the 21st, the happy party marched out with Sale’s brigade to Killa Kaze, a village close to Cabul. At 2 P.M. on the same day they started for General Pollock’s camp on the plain east of Cabul. Near the tomb of the Emperor Baber they passed General Nott’s camp. Thence their road lay through the city. The streets were almost empty, and unnatural silence prevailed. A striking contrast to the noise and bustle of former days ! They passed the spot where Burnes’s house had stood. That house was now a heap of rubbish, and its pretty garden a desolate waste. It was here that the unfortunate man used to look forward with enthusiasm to the rapid melioration of the country through the agency of British enterprise and skill. An unreal fatal vision, and awfully dissipated ! The party entered General Pollock’s camp at sunset. Again the artillery uttered its boisterous notes of welcome, and old friends crowded around with their hearty congratulations. For the present their cup of joy was full. But when the first rapture was over, rest

* Lady Sale’s Journal.

and reflection, and the scenes which surrounded them, must have brought to their recollection the thousands that had perished, and the many friends whose bones lay bleaching on the mountain-tops or in the dreadful passes.

Victory was now perched upon the British standard wherever it was raised. One of the most confident predictions of those who had pleaded for the continuance of the Company's commercial charter and monopoly of the China trade had been verified: from the moment that that trade had been thrown open, there had been nothing but dissension and confusion at Canton, and the quarrel had led to war, and to the invasion of the Celestial Empire by a British fleet and army. The victories obtained in the rivers and on the plains of China were rapidly rumoured throughout India, and produced a salutary impression among the mountains of Afghanistan, as well as in other neighbouring countries. They warned all our enemies that our enterprise, our strength, and resources were undiminished. On the 21st of September Lord Ellenborough, being then at Simla, in the Himalaya mountains, issued an encouraging proclamation, in which he stated that he had that very day received the reports of three victories: one obtained on the 30th of August, by Major-General Nott over 12,000 Afghans, thirty-eight miles to the southward of Ghuznee; one, on the 8th of September, by Major-General Pollock, over the troops of Mohammed Akbar Khan and the Ghilzee Chiefs at Jugdulluk, and one on the 16th of June, by the expedition on the coast of China, within the mouth of the river Yang-tse-Kiang. Before the news of these victories reached them, our old foes in Nepaul and some of the Rajpoot tribes in central India were in a state of violent excitement, and even the Burmese looked anxiously towards China, and seemed more than half determined to try again the fortune of war by invading Arracan and the Tenasserim provinces. But as soon as it was known that the Chinese were flying before our troops, that the Afghans had been beaten in every encounter, and that Cabul had been recaptured,

both Burmese and Nepaulese, together with every independent state in Hindustan, gave up their warlike projects, and hastened to make the most amicable professions to our Indian Government.

We had, however, had quite enough of Afghan connexions and interferences; there was no longer a man that could be deluded by a vision like that of Burnes; we had released our captives, retrieved the honour of our arms, and by a series of well-ordered and gloriously-fought battles reduced the Afghan pride; and therefore it was felt that we had little else to do than to vacate a country which we ought never to have entered, and leave the khans and dans to their own anarchy. On the 1st of October Lord Ellenborough issued a proclamation from Simla, the spot where Lord Auckland had declared the war, stating that the disasters in Afghanistan having been avenged upon every scene of past misfortune, the British troops would be withdrawn to the Sutledge. And on the 12th of October, after destroying the fortifications, the grand bazaar, two mosques, and other buildings, the British troops evacuated Cabul, and marched off in three divisions for Jellalabad, where they arrived in the course of the 22nd and the two following days.

On Saturday the 17th of December, they reached the right bank of the Sutledge opposite Ferozepoor, and crossed that river on a bridge of boats decorated with flags. Reviews, dinners, and balls ensued. In proposing the health of General Sale and the brave garrison of Jellalabad, Lord Ellenborough said that it was they who had saved the name and fame of the British empire in India. At a grand review on the 31st of December, 24,000 troops and 102 guns were mustered on this one spot.

Of the war in China we can say but little. The Chinese displayed on some occasions a wonderful degree of fortitude and power of endurance, but of a brilliant or active courage they gave very few proofs; and their military science was altogether contemptible. A very small British army might have marched through and

through the empire. Most of our troops that were actually engaged were ashamed of their easy conquest. There seemed hardly anything for them to do but to move forward and kill or scatter.

The quarrel had commenced almost immediately after the alteration of the East India Company's charter which threw open the trade of China as well as that of India. The Chinese were enormous consumers of opium, and their supplies were almost wholly derived from Hindustan. The moral government of the celestial empire, shocked at the prevalence of this worst kind of drunkenness, had long been fulminating terrible prohibitory decrees; but the Chinamen could not do without their opium; the ministers of the law themselves had a very general love for the drug, and the mandarins and other officers employed to stop the importation went shares with those who carried on the contraband trade. The experienced sea-captains, factors, and servants of the East India Company had carried on this trade with great quietness and decorum, and with the order and regularity of an organized body. But the case was different when the free trade began, and when unpractised and impatient skippers and supercargoes repaired to Canton. The court of Peking was roused into a fury by the proceedings of these men; the opium on shore was seized, together with a large amount of British property; and the tea trade and all other trade with us was declared to be suspended. In 1834 Lord Grey's government sent out Lord Napier to Canton to act as chief superintendent, and to endeavour to make up the quarrel. The viceroy of Canton refused to receive Lord Napier's letter, and peremptorily ordered his lordship to quit the factory, which is situated outside of Canton. His lordship refused either to communicate with the viceroy as a petitioner, or to leave the factory. On the 7th of September, 1834, as his Majesty's ships the 'Andromache' and 'Imogene' were approaching the Bogue, or Bocca Tigris passage, they were surrounded by a crowd of war-junks, and assailed by a fire from the Chinese forts. The English reserved their fire until

they were in the narrowest part of the passage, and close to the paltry mud-forts, when a broadside or two did their business, silencing them and scattering the panic-stricken Chinese. Unfortunately Lord Napier was seized by a dangerous illness, which, with a difference of opinion that arose among the members of the British chambers of commerce, induced him to return to Macao, where he died on the 11th of October, 1834. As soon as his lordship's decease was known, the chamber of commerce at Canton named Mr. John Francis Davis, formerly of the East India Company's factory at Canton, to succeed him as chief superintendent. But all the experience of Mr. Davis was of no avail; and our relations remained in a most unsatisfactory state, the tea trade being at times allowed and at times suspended, and a rancorous feeling being displayed by the government on all occasions. Conflicts took place in the Canton river between some of our boats and the Chinese junks; and the authorities issued an order to interdict the supply of food of any kind to the British in China. On the 5th of January, 1840, an imperial edict directed all trade with England to cease for ever. On the 9th of June an attempt was made to burn all the English ships by means of fire-junks. A few days after this attempt Sir Gordon Bremer, who had arrived with 15 men-of-war, 4 steamers, and 4000 soldiers, published a notice of the blockade of Canton. Something like a regular war now commenced. Part of our fleet proceeded northward on the east coast of China. On the 5th of July, 1840, the city of Shang-hai, in Chusan, surrendered to our squadron. A blockade was now established from Ning-po to the mouth of the Keang River. In the month of November of that same year the court of Pekin condescended to despatch plenipotentiaries to treat with us for a peace; but in the beginning of January, 1841, while we were in the midst of the negotiations, an edict was issued that all Englishmen and all English ships should be destroyed wherever they should be met with near China. In consequence of this violation of the existing truce, our soldiers and sailors attacked and

carried several forts. As they were on the point of attacking the forts at the Bocca Tigris, Admiral Kwan solicited another armistice, which was granted by Captain Elliott. On the 23rd of February, after other instances of bad faith, hostilities were resumed against China. Formal possession was now taken of Hong Kong. The Bogue forts were reduced by Sir Gordon Bremer; Admiral Kwan was killed, 459 guns were captured, and the British squadron proceeded up the River to Canton. At the beginning of March, 1841, Sir Hugh Gough arrived with some slight reinforcements, and took the command of our land forces. On the 18th of March the Chinese having fired upon a flag of truce, our forces destroyed a flotilla of boats, captured 461 guns, threatened the city of Canton, and took possession of the foreign factories. After another hollow truce the Chinese attacked the British ships with great guns and fire-works. Our forces then began operations in earnest; and by the 25th of May all the heights behind Canton were occupied by British troops, and 90 more guns were taken. On the 27th of May the authorities of Canton agreed to pay six millions of dollars for the ransom of the city, in consequence of which another cessation of hostilities was granted. The Chinese paid five millions and gave security for the remainder on the 31st of May. Our forces were then withdrawn from Canton, and the British trade was re-opened. In the month of August of the same year, 1841, Sir Henry Pottinger arrived in the Macao Roads, as sole plenipotentiary of Her Britannic Majesty. As the Chinese would not agree to terms, and as their government still urged the extermination of the English, war was renewed with vigour. On the 27th of August the town of Amoy was captured by the British, who there destroyed 296 guns. In October Shang-hai was taken after some resistance, and Ning-po without any resistance at all. The total number of Chinese guns taken or destroyed during these operations was immense. In December Yu-Yaon, Tsze-kee and Foong-hua were carried by the British. On the 10th of March, 1842, from 10,000 to 12,000 Chinese

troops, in attempting to recover Ning-po and Shang-hai were repulsed with great slaughter; and five days after this 8000 of them were routed with great loss in an intrenched camp. After a few other operations the British squadron entered the great river Keang, capturing Wooshung, and Shang-hai, and taking more than 230 guns. On the 21st of July the city of Chin-Keang was stormed and taken. Here something like a bold stand was made; and when the victory of the British was decided, the Tartar general and many of the garrison committed suicide. By the 9th of August, our whole fleet being arrived at Nankin, a most populous city, and second in consequence only to Peking, the disembarkation of our troops was begun. Here the proud court of Peking fairly gave up the struggle. On the 20th of August Chinese plenipotentiaries waited with a rare and becoming humility on Sir Henry Pottinger on board the 'Cornwallis;' and in that ship, and in front of the walls of Nankin, a treaty of peace was signed on the 29th of August, 1842. The most important provisions of the treaty were the following:—

1. Lasting peace and friendship between the two empires.
2. China to pay 21,000,000 dollars in the course of the present and three succeeding years.
3. The ports of Canton, Amoy, Foo-choo-Foo, Ning-po, and Shang-hai to be thrown open to British merchants; consular officers to be appointed to reside at them; and regular and just tariffs of import and export, as well as inland transit duties, to be established and published.
4. The island of Hong-Kong to be ceded in perpetuity to Her Britannic Majesty, her heirs and successors.
5. All subjects of her Britannic majesty, whether natives of Europe or India, who may be confined in any part of the Chinese empire, to be unconditionally released.
6. An act of full and entire amnesty to be published by the emperor, under his imperial sign-manual and seal, to all Chinese subjects, on account of their having held service under the British government or its officers.
7. Correspondence to be conducted on terms of perfect *equality* between the officers of both governments.

A part of the money being paid on the 8th of August, her Britannic majesty's forces began to retire from Nankin and the Grand Canal.

From this point our abridgement can be little more than a chronological table of the most important of the recent events.

Lord Ellenborough had scarcely brought to an honourable close the hostilities in Afghanistan ere he found himself of necessity involved in another war. The Ameers of Sind had behaved in a treacherous manner while our troops were engaged and suffering their unspeakable disasters among the Afghan mountains. They had suffered some pecuniary loss, and they fancied they had suffered still more (besides a loss of honour) by a treaty into which they had been forced by Lord Auckland at the advice of Burnes. They had been obliged to renounce their transit duties on merchandise going up and down the Indus, and as yet they had seen nothing of that "hundredfold" benefit which had been promised them in the treaty. Moreover, only some of the chiefs had entered into this treaty; and all of them were excited by the apprehension that the English intended to dispossess them of their hunting-grounds which lie along the banks of the Indus, and which, besides being the source of their chief and almost only amusement, were far more profitable to them than any trade up and down the river was likely to be for many a year.

These chiefs were a brave and very vain set of men, almost as self-confident and presumptuous as the Burmese had been before the appearance of our army on the Irrawadi; and hence it was surmised that they would fly to arms rather than submit much longer even to the existing treaty.

"Delusion as to the circumstances under which we retired from Afghanistan," says Lord Ellenborough, "and ignorance of our real strength, which they never experienced, would have induced a brave and barbarous people of plunderers to avail themselves of the first

occasion in which we might be involved in difficulties to endeavour to *throw off engagements which they entered into with reluctance, and to compel our retirement from the Indus.*"

It is said, too, that the Ameers could not restrain their own people, and much less the armed retainers of their neighbours; and it is pretty obvious that our India government preferred attacking and breaking their strength now to waiting for a future collision when they might choose their own time and possibly take us by surprise. They signed a new treaty on the 14th of February, 1843, and broke it one day afterwards by attacking the residence of the British commissioners with a large force; but then it is alleged that though the treaty had been signed and everything conceded that we asked for, Sir Charles Napier continued to advance, being apparently resolved to conquer Hyderabad, their capital, in spite of the treaty. On the other hand, it is said that the Ameers were tempted by the smallness of Napier's force and the magnitude of their own to attack him, and that they never intended to abide by the concessions they had made. We can well believe the last of these two assertions; but, in our view of the case, the concessions, so far from being worth fighting for, were not worth asking for. On the 17th of February, three days after the signing of the treaty, and two days after the foul attack on our commissioners, a severe battle was fought at a place about twenty miles from Hyderabad, where the Ameers brought every man into action that they could muster. The battle has been compared to the battle of Assaye, and Napier's conduct in it to that of the Duke of Wellington in the first of his great field-days, when victory alighted upon his crest never to desert it. The resistance of the enemy was of a most obstinate and determined character, and much, no doubt, was done by the general commanding. Our troops staggered more than once, and were rallied and led on by the brave fighting old Napier in person. In the end the victory was complete as victory could be. Our army marched on, and occupied Hyderabad on the

20th. The result has been the annexation of the country to our possessions. In a few short sentences Lord Ellenborough appointed Sir Charles Napier governor of "the province of Sind," abolished slavery and all duties of transit in every part of Sind which now was, or hereafter might be, occupied by our army, and declared the navigation of the Indus free to all nations.

Before the close of this same year, 1843, we were engaged with the Mahrattas, who had broken their treaties with the Indian government, and rebelled against the young and helpless maha-rajah, whom we were bound by treaty to support. They had also committed a series of most atrocious murders, and were committing other excesses which called for immediate repression. The governor-general advanced in person with an army to the strong fortress of Gwalior. Our troops, under the command of Sir Hugh Gough, were about 14,000 strong, with 40 pieces of artillery: the Mahrattas brought to the field 18,000 men, including 3000 cavalry, with 100 guns. On the 29th of December, 1843, a terrible battle was fought at Maharajpoor, which ended in another victory to the British, who however lost 797 men in killed and wounded. On the same day another decisive victory was gained by Major-General Grey, who had moved with a division of the army to Punniar, about 12 miles from Gwalior. In consequence of these two victories the Mahratta durbar submitted to the demands of the Indian government—Colonel Stubbs remained governor of the fort of Gwalior, which commands the city; the plundering Mahratta troops were disbanded, and a British contingent was to be maintained in the country at the cost of the Gwalior government, which also agreed to pay forthwith the expenses of the campaign.

In all his operations Lord Ellenborough had been remarkably successful; but he had enemies in India, and more enemies at home. In the session of 1843 his policy was bitterly assailed by the Whig ex-ministers, who had involved us in the ruinous Afghan war, and who had meanly contemplated withdrawing our forces from that country, and trusting to negotiation with the

barbarians for the recovery of our captives. His lordship was warmly defended by Sir R. Peel and the Duke of Wellington. "The difficulties in India," said the duke, "are now far greater than what they formerly were, because there has now been set up what is called a 'free press,' but what I shall call a *licentious* press! With a British population in India of not more than 50,000 persons, including 25,000 British troops, how is that country to be governed if the feelings of the natives are to be worked upon by a press like this?" Lord Brougham also defended the governor-general, as also did Lord Stanley and Mr. Hogg, the latter being one of the most competent authorities on India matters that could anywhere be found. Lord Ellenborough however had piqued the pride of the Court of Directors; and that court, having by their charter power so to do, recalled his lordship in April, 1844. Sir Henry Hardinge being appointed his successor, repaired immediately to India. Sir Henry on his arrival found that our troops in Sind were suffering greatly from the unhealthiness of the climate, and that a mutinous spirit appeared in several Bengal native regiments that were under orders to march into that country. Like so many of his predecessors who had gone to India with most pacific intentions, Sir Henry soon found himself compelled to gird on the sword. Since the death of Runjeet Sing, the Lion of Lahore, the Sikh country had been convulsed by a continuity of revolutions, murders, and massacres; and the Sikh chiefs and soldiers had become as lawless as the Mahrattas in the time of the Marquis Wellesley. Shortly after the arrival of the new governor-general, daily reports were spread that these Sikhs intended to invade the British territories. The orders from the home authorities were so stringent not to interfere with the Punjaub, unless actual aggression were first perpetrated by the Sikhs, that the Indian government was crippled; and, acting on his instructions, the governor-general, who was then in the upper provinces, did not deem it advisable to take measures for raising an army capable of opposing the Sikhs, should they actually cross the

Sutledge. Sir Henry Hardinge, if I decision, would no doubt have taken, at the steps which he afterwards adopted mirable energy and promptitude.* [W ever, that operations must have been sor by the reductions recently made in our long frontier line.] It was different Gough, the commander-in-chief. He v of his army. His acts were under the governor-general, so far as organizing ar cerned; but, trusting to his own foresi experience, he gave early warning to t frontier, as well as to those at the im station of Meerut, to hold themselves Most fortunately Lord Ellenborough, in this storm, had established a large fo which could be available at a moment's r

So soon as it was known that a Sikh fo crossed the Sutledge and invaded our terr were put in motion with admirable celerit made were wonderful. On the 18th o first encounter took place at Moodke were fatigued by a very long march t country†. The Sikhs were quite fres numerous artillery, and had become ex men under the training of Avitabile, Ve European officers; we had merely a fe not having had time sufficient to brin guns. Nothing was to be done but to c at the bayonet point. They were we the jungle and stunted trees. The sma of British infantry (her majesty's 9th, 80th regiments) charged amidst a murde non and of musketry, the Sikh infantry The columns of this fierce and formida

* Doctor Mac Gregor 'History of the Si
† Id.

‡ "The troops were in a state of great
cipally from the want of water, which
on the road."—Commander-in-Chief's I

however, broken and dispersed, but not before they had made a desperate stand and committed great slaughter among the European officers and men. Sir Robert Sale fell mortally wounded. Sir John Mac Caskill was shot dead, and almost every officer on the staff of the governor-general was either killed or wounded. The 3rd light dragoons, being the only European cavalry present, pursued the flying Sikhs. The force thus defeated was only an experimental one. The *grande corps-d'armée*, with 500 guns of all calibre, were as yet on the other side of the Sutledge. Though thoroughly beaten at Moodkee, they were satisfied that, with an overwhelming number of guns strongly intrenched, they might withstand the attack of the British.

On the 19th of December some heavy guns, escorted by her majesty's 29th, the 1st European light infantry, and some native regiments, reached Moodkee. The Sikhs, in column after column, were crossing the Sutledge, boasting that they would march on to Delhi, Benares, Calcutta! On the 21st of December their pride was abated by the terrible battle of Feerozshuhur, or Feerozshah. They had brought up a stupendous artillery, and were strongly intrenched. The battle is told by the gallant commander-in-chief in a few words:—"The Sikh guns could not be silenced by the British, and the infantry therefore advanced, amidst a murderous shower of shot and grape, and captured them."* On the setting in of night the European infantry remained in the portion of the camp which they had captured, while the Sikhs occupied the rest; their cavalry and infantry moving about the whole night, harassing and firing on the British who were bivouacked. Now and then they brought up a gun and fired grape among our wearied sleepy people. They had nothing for it but to remain quiet, and await the return of daylight. But their position was a fearful one! Before the intrenchments were entered, her majesty's 62nd were "absolutely mowed down by the fire under which they were advancing."† Before the battle could be renewed

* Dispatch.

† Speech of the Duke of Wellington in the House of Lords, on the 26th February, 1846.

on the 22nd, Tej Sing brought up to the Sikhs' fresh battalions and a large field of artillery, supported by 30,000 Ghorchurras, or irregular cavalry. Our own weak cavalry was unavailing, our artillery of little or no use: everything had to be done, and ~~was~~ done, by our indomitable British and Irish infantry! The Sikhs were driven out of the camp, and were beaten and broken wherever they attempted a stand. We lost in killed and wounded more than 2000 men; 37 officers were killed, and double that number wounded. Between the battle of Moodkee and this double battle of Feerozshah, our total loss in killed and wounded exceeded 3000. The commander-in-chief, Sir Hugh Gough, commanded the right wing; while the left was under the command of Sir Henry Hardinge, who set aside his dignity doubly and trebly, and volunteered his services as second in command. Sir Harry Smith commanded the first infantry division, Major-General Gilbert the second, Brigadier Wallace the third, and Sir John Littler the fourth. All these officers were engaged in the thickest of the fight, and behaved with equal skill and gallantry. Wallace was killed by a cannon shot.

The commander-in-chief resolved to wait for the guns and mortars then moving upwards, with the 9th and 16th lancers, and her majesty's 10th and 53rd foot. The Sindie troops, under Sir Charles Napier, had also been ordered up.

The Sikhs resolved to make another effort to maintain their position on the left bank of the Sutledge; and for this purpose they began to construct a new bridge of boats below Hurrakee. As soon as this bridge was finished more Sikhs began to cross over. We have no space for any of the minor details. Sir Harry Smith gained a brilliant victory over a detached Sikh force, at Alleewal, on the 28th of January, capturing or destroying all their guns. Having finished their bridge of boats, the Sikhs busily employed themselves in making intrenchments, a tête de pont, &c., at Sobraon. Though at Moodkee, Feerozshah, and Alleewal they had lost upwards of 150 guns, they had united a formidable number on this point. The soldiers collected within these intrenchments at So-

braon were those who had been best trained by the French and Italian officers: these men felt assured that their position could not be taken by the best of troops; and they quietly waited the attack. Sir Hugh Gough did not keep them long waiting. He put his army in motion on the morning of Tuesday, the 10th of February, 1846, and in a very few hours the works of Sobraon were in his possession, and the Sikhs in headlong flight across the Sutledge. In their efforts to reach the right bank through the deepened water, the enemy suffered a terrible carnage from our horse artillery. Hundreds fell under the cannonade; hundreds upon hundreds were drowned in attempting the perilous passage.* This was a glorious fight, and complete in its results. Nearly every gun of the Sikhs was captured, together with numerous standards. Such a victory, however, could not be achieved without an immense sacrifice; and there are few actions on record where so many officers were killed and wounded. The brave Sir Robert Dick fell in the attack on the camp; Brigadier M'Leod was hit while leading the 4th brigade of the centre division against the strongest part of the intrenchment at Sobraon, and was borne off the field mortally wounded; Brigadier Charles Cyril Taylor, who commanded the 29th foot, was killed; Major-General Gilbert, and the veteran Colonel Ryan, of the 50th, were wounded; and many other distinguished officers fell among the slain, or were carried maimed to the hospitals.

The Punjaub was occupied by the British without any repetition of the hard struggle which had occurred on the left bank of the Sutledge. On the 14th of February, 1846, the governor-general issued a proclamation:—"The Sikh army," said he, "has been expelled from the left bank of the Sutledge, having been defeated in every action, with the loss of more than 220 pieces of field artillery. The British army has crossed the Sutledge and entered the Punjaub. The governor-general announces, by this proclamation, that this measure has

* *Dispatch of the Commander-in-Chief.*

been adopted in accordance with the intentions expressed in the proclamation of the 13th December last, as having been forced upon the governor-general for the purpose of effectually protecting the British provinces; for vindicating the authority of the British government, and for punishing the violaters of treaties, and the disturbers of the public peace."

On the 17th of February our siege-guns crossed the bridge along with the 4th brigade, under the command of Brigadier Orchard. The army then steadily marched upon Lahore, the capital, which was entered on the 20th without any opposition. The remnant of the Sikh army quietly yielded, and delivered up more guns. The Ranee saw that the only power on which she could rely for the stability of her young son's throne, and her own and his personal safety, was the British army. A treaty was concluded: the governor-general was to leave a force at Lahore, to prop up the young rajah's government; the Rajah or Mahah Rajah Goolab Sing, was to be allowed to become master of the rich province of Cashmere; and indemnities were to be paid to the British.*

There could not have been a more honourable conclusion to our military history than Sir Charles Napier's war against the Ameers of Sind, and these glorious combats on the Sutledge; they effaced the disgrace which had befallen us in Afghanistan; they more than renewed our former prestige; and they told the princes and potentates of India and the countries thereto adjacent that the power of Britain was as great, and the spirit of her soldiers as high, as ever they had been.

Ireland continued to be agitated by Daniel O'Connell and his monster meetings. There was a meeting at Tara on the 22nd of August, 1843; and another great meeting at Mullaghmast, on the 1st of October, to call for the repeal of the Union. In the same year, 1843, Wales usually so tranquil, became the scene of the nocturnal exploits of "Rebecca and her children." These rioters made a war upon turnpike-gates, and were singularly

* Dr. Macgregor's 'History of the Sikhs,' &c.

skilful in eluding the vigilance of the military and police. They suddenly appeared in large bodies at given signals—the flight of a rocket, or bonfires on the hills; and they disappeared with equal alacrity and mystery. The system of turnpike-tolls was, and long had been, extravagantly high and oppressive in the extreme to the poor Welsh farmers and others. On the 10th of October, 1843, the Gazette announced the appointment of a commission to inquire into the operation of the turnpike laws in Wales, and the causes which had led to the recent outrages. Those laws were properly altered, and then the outrages ceased.

England and Scotland were agitated by the Anti-Corn-law League, which, under the main guidance of Mr. Cobden, made itself almost a power in the state; and it continued to augment its influence until it may be said to have dictated to the government. The funds they raised by voluntary subscription were immense, and were not always spent in a manner of which sober-minded men could approve. At one great free-trade meeting, held at Manchester on the 14th of November, 1843, the sum of 12,606*l.* was subscribed as a contribution to the Anti-Corn-law League. Many converts were made towards the end of 1845; Lord Morpeth announced to an anti-corn-law meeting at Leeds his conviction “that the time is come for the final repeal of the corn-laws.” In December of that year, cabinet councils were held very frequently, and reports were spread that serious differences had arisen between the leading members of Sir Robert Peel’s government on this vital question. On the 10th of that month Sir Robert Peel and his cabinet resigned. Lord John Russell was sent for by the Queen, but having failed in his attempts to form a ministry, Sir Robert Peel re-accepted office on the 20th; but Lord Stanley resigned the seals of the Colonial Office, which were transferred to Mr. Gladstone. On the 3rd of January, 1846, addresses from the corporations of London and Dublin were presented to her majesty at Windsor: they both alluded to the unhappy failure of the potato crop, and suggested the necessity of *opening the ports for the admission of foreign corn*

duty free. Thus famine came to the aid of the anti-corn-law leaguers. A few days after this a great free-trade meeting was held in the amphitheatre at Liverpool, and 14,000*l.* were raised in aid of the league fund. The protectionists also held their meetings, and adopted resolutions imploring that no alteration in the old corn-laws might be made. But by this time a good portion even of the agricultural interest had become convinced that the old laws were prejudicial and not beneficial to them; that such laws could not be upheld; and that the intelligent British farmer might live and flourish without any such protection. On the 23rd of February a meeting of agricultural labourers was held by torch-light on a heath in Hampshire, "to talk over the miseries of their condition." The conclusion come to was to petition for the repeal of the corn-laws. Lord Melbourne now gave it as his "decided opinion that the measure had been delayed too long." Serious provision riots took place in Ireland. Sir Robert Peel having made up his mind, and calculated that the measure could be carried, hastily brought in a bill for a free-trade in corn. This was passed by the House of Commons on the 16th May, 1846, by a majority of 98; and having been carried through the Lords, it received the royal assent on the 21st of June. The Anti-Corn-law League then quietly dissolved itself, and Sir Robert Peel and his colleagues tendered their resignations, which were accepted on the 6th of July.

At this important point—at the commencement of a grand experiment—we close our brief narrative of the events of the last thirty years. Much we have of necessity omitted; but we trust that we have related that for which we had room with a true national spirit, and without party prejudices of any kind; and that these two last volumes may prove useful as an epitome.

The happy promise with which Queen Victoria, in the flower of her youth, began to reign, has hitherto been well fulfilled: her domestic virtues are models for imitation, and her public conduct has been truly English, and such as became the grand-daughter of George III.

CHAPTER II.

THE HISTORY OF RELIGION.

THE period between the years of 1760, when George III. ascended the throne, and 1846, when our narrative of civil and military events has closed, was one of progressive toleration in religion.

Indeed, notwithstanding the very flourishing outward appearance which it presented at the time of the accession of George III., the progress of legislation and of events between the Revolution and that date had probably, upon the whole, tended to lower the position and power of the established church as much as its principles. It is true that the reigns of William, of Anne, and of George I., had produced a long series of new and severe penal enactments against popery both in England and Ireland; but that these laws conferred any new security or strength upon the establishment may be more than questioned. With the exception, perhaps, of the short reign of James II., the established church had been in no danger from popery since the reign of James I. or of Elizabeth. Nor was the hatred of popery, which had mainly produced both the Revolution and the penal laws, so much a feeling of the Church as of the Puritans and Dissenters, whose outcry about the matter of the church chimed in rather from policy than out of any real or very ardent sympathy. Ever since the rise and spread of dissent, popery had been naturally rather the reserved auxiliary of the established church than a hostile force. If the church had not a greater affinity in spirit with popery than with dissent, popery was at least separated by much stronger antipathies from dissent than from the church, and that would have equally determined the arrangement of parties in any new struggle that might arise. It

never, therefore, could really have been an object with the church to depress popery beyond a certain point: that, in so far as it was done, was the doing of the Dissenters, and was a victory gained by them at the expense of the establishment. But, at any rate, the persecution of the Roman Catholics, whether good for the church or the reverse, had for some time past been going out of fashion; no new penal laws had been placed on the statute-book for the last forty-five years; and of those that had been previously enacted the most severe were now rarely, if ever, enforced.

The number of dissenting communities continued on the increase. The Methodists, who were the most numerous, took up no attitude of hostility to the established church. Of the religious communities of more recent origin, or at least of more recent appearance in this country, the most remarkable were the Moravians, or United Brethren, and the Swedenborgians, calling themselves "The Church of the New Jerusalem." Count Zinzendorff, who visited England in 1749, died in 1760. Baron Emanuel Swedenborg, the founder of the sect calling themselves by his name, professed to have received the first of his divine revelations in London in the year 1743, and died here in 1772. He obtained many followers in his lifetime in England as well as in other parts of Europe and in America; and his disciples still form a considerable community in this country.

This process, which had been one of relaxation in regard to the Protestant sectaries ever since the Revolution, had, as we have seen already, begun to take that character before the commencement of the present period even in regard to the Roman Catholics, at least in England and Ireland. After more than sixty years had passed without any additions having been made to the penal code, the first actual repeal of any part of that code was effected by the English and Irish statutes of the year 1778. And the following year witnessed the last mitigation we have yet had to record of the less severe restrictions or disabilities which the legislation

that preceded the Revolution of 1688 had imposed upon the Protestant Dissenters.

No attempt was made by this latter description of persons to obtain any further relief till after the lapse of several years. But at last they resolved to make application to parliament for the repeal of the two statutes of the 13th of Charles II. st. 2, c. 1, and of the 25th of Charles II. c. 2, commonly called the Corporation and Test Acts, which made the taking of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, according to the rites of the church of England, a necessary qualification for being elected to any municipal office, or for holding any office of trust or profit under the crown, whether civil or military. By an act passed in 1718 (the 5 Geo. I. c. 6) the first of these two statutes was so far repealed, as that the not having taken the Sacrament within the period prescribed (a twelvemonth before the election) no longer made the election of the party *ipso facto* void; and then the Annual Indemnity Acts protected persons who neglected to qualify themselves within the six months succeeding the election, within which the time for removal or prosecution was now limited. Relief had also been already granted to the Protestant Dissenters in Ireland from disabilities similar to those which these statutes imposed, by an act of the parliament of that kingdom passed in 1779, which declared that all persons, being Protestants, might there hold and enjoy any office, civil or military, notwithstanding they should not receive nor have received the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, without incurring any penalties for or in respect of that neglect. The claim of the English Protestant Dissenters to be placed in the same condition with their Irish brethren was brought before the House of Commons on the 28th of March, 1787, by Mr. Beaufoy, member for Yarmouth, in a motion that the House should immediately resolve itself into a committee to consider the Test and Corporation Acts, which he prefaced by a long speech. He described the persons aggrieved by the provisions in these laws, which made the taking of the sacrament a necessary qualification for office, as consisting of three classes;

—the first, composed of all those Englishmen who were Dissenters from the Church of England; the second, of all the members of the Established Church of Scotland; the third, of all those clergymen of the Church of England who looked upon the prostitution of the most solemn ordinance of their faith to the purposes of a civil test as little less than a sacrilegious abuse. The English Dissenters, however, were the body of which Mr. Beaufoy professed to be more especially the deputy or organ on this occasion. “The Dissenters of England,” he said, “are chiefly composed of the Presbyterians, the Independents, and the Baptists, who differ in many circumstances of doctrine and discipline, but who all agree in the custom of annually appointing two deputies from each of their congregations in the metropolis for the management of their affairs; a custom which has long been established among them. Now, it is by the unanimous voice of that assembly of delegates, supported by the wishes, earnestly expressed in letters, of their brethren in all parts of the kingdom, that the present request solicits the attention of parliament.” The motion was supported by Lord Beauchamp and Mr. William Smith, whose speeches, however, contained nothing worth quoting, unless we should except an admission made by Smith, that the number of the Dissenters was of late much decreased, from which he argued that the government had now less to fear from them than at any former period, and could therefore better afford to relax the restrictions of the old laws. Sir James Johnstone, representative of the Dumfries burghs, said he was determined to vote in favour of the motion, which, however, he intimated that he considered to be very much a piece of humbug; and he seems, after all, to have voted against it. Pitt then rose and spoke on the other side, but, apparently, with no great ardour.

When the House divided, the numbers were found to be, for Beaufoy’s motion, 98; against it, 176.

For the next two years the question was allowed to sleep; but it was again brought before the same parliament, by the same advocate, on the 8th of May, 1789.

Mr. Beaufoy's motion on this occasion was substantially the same as before,—that the House would immediately resolve itself into a committee to consider of so much of the Corporation and Test Acts as required persons, before being admitted into any office or place in corporations, or having accepted any office, civil or military, or any place of trust under the crown, to receive the sacrament of the Lord's Supper according to the rites of the Church of England. The motion was again opposed by Lord North, and also by Pitt; but their speeches contained nothing new, although the former seems to have spoken with increased earnestness, the latter with even less ardour than he showed in the former debate. They were answered by several members, among others, by Fox, who spoke at considerable length, and with his usual animation and force. Fox's able speech was almost wholly argumentative. He and Pitt were followed by Windham, who supported the motion principally on the ground that, even supposing the Dissenters to be hostile to the established church, the repeal of the Corporation and Test Acts, while it removed an irritating stigma, could give them no more real power than they already had; and then the House divided, when the motion was negatived, but only by the narrow majority of 122 against 102.

A few days after this decision of the Commons, an unsuccessful attempt was made in the other House by Lord Stanhope to rid the statute book of some old laws, which he conceived to press with unnecessary severity, not so much upon Dissenters as upon members of the established church. It is certain that, whatever might be the grievances thus sustained by the class of persons who were the objects of his lordship's present anxiety, this ingenious but most eccentric peer, who never professed much attachment either to church or state, was about the last member of the legislature whom the great mass of them would have chosen for their advocate. However, on the 18th of May, his lordship, self-elected to this office, came forward, according to previous notice, *with what he designated* "A Bill for relieving members

of the Church of England from sundry penalties and disabilities to which, by the laws now in force, they may be liable, and for extending freedom in matters of religion to all persons (Papists only excepted), and for other purposes therein mentioned." In a debate on the Regency Bill, on the 17th of February, Stanhope, following the example of Mr. William Smith in the Commons, had moved an amendment on what was called the Uniformity Clause (prohibiting the regent from giving the royal assent to any bill for repealing the act passed in the time of Charles II., for the uniformity of public prayers), with the view, as he explained himself, of preventing that clause from standing in the way of the repeal of a number of preceding statutes, which were referred to and ratified in the Uniformity Act; and upon that occasion he had rapidly reviewed some of the most remarkable of these old laws, and pointed out what he considered their absurd and persecuting character. He was replied to by the Archbishop of Canterbury (Moore) and the Bishops of Salisbury (Barrington) and Gloucester (Halifax), none of whom, however, attempted to defend the enactments in question: they merely deprecated such a discussion at that moment, as having nothing to do with the business in hand, and argued that the ancient penal provisions, to which attention had been called, had been long buried in oblivion, and had wholly ceased to be enforced. In his present bill, and in the speech with which he introduced it, Stanhope gave a more elaborate and methodical exposition of the old laws respecting religion still remaining on the statute book, which he described as being a disgrace to the country, although he professed to notice only about a tenth part of them, being convinced, as he said, that that sample would prove more than sufficient to induce the House to pass the bill.

In the first place there were the laws about going to church; of which the principal were, that every person must attend at church every Sunday and holiday, or forfeit twelve pence (by the 1 Eliz. c. 2, § 14); that every person above the age of sixteen, not going to

church for a month, should forfeit 20*l.*, and should besides, after absenting himself twelve months, be bound with two sufficient sureties in 200*l.* at the least for his good behaviour, until he should conform.

Then there were the laws about fasting. The enactments contained in the 5 Eliz. c. 5, entitled "An Act touching politic constitutions for the maintenance of the Navy," by which every person who should eat flesh upon a fish-day was made liable to a fine of three pounds, or to three months' close imprisonment, had indeed expired: but Stanhope complained that the eating of meat on the old fish-days was still an ecclesiastical offence; and he proposed to declare in his bill that no person should for the future be sued in any ecclesiastical court for eating any kind of meat on any day of fasting or of abstinence.

Thirdly, there were the laws about rites, excommunication, &c. "Excommunicated persons," says Dr. Burn, "shall be inhibited the commerce and communion of the faithful; and they who communicate with them shall be punished by ecclesiastical censure;" and he lays it down that by commerce is meant buying or selling, or other interchange of wares or merchandise; and that "where a man is excommunicated by the law of holy church, and he sueth an action real or personal, the defendant may plead that he who sueth is excommunicated;" so that, as Lord Stanhope remarked, no person excommunicated could recover a just debt. "Besides which," continued his lordship, "a writ *de excommunicato capiendo* may, in various cases, be issued out against the person excommunicated, who may be arrested thereupon and kept in prison."

That the bill might have the better chance of success, a number of provisoes were inserted in it, the more strictly to limit its operation to its professed object. The first of these provisoes was, that nothing in the act should extend to the giving relief to the Papists. And the language which his lordship held upon this head is instructive as to the state of opinion at the time. He "expatiated concerning what he described as the various abominable, execrable, and dangerous principles of Papists,

which made them unsafe citizens of the state. But was," he said, "with particular satisfaction that he saw in the House the other day when his noble friend and him (Lord Rawdon) presented a petition from persons styling themselves Catholic Dissenters, in which petition those persons utterly disclaimed, reprobated, and protested against the principles of popery. Therefore it appeared to him just that the law should some day draw a line of discrimination between the persecuting Papists and those who publicly and unequivocally disclaimed those abominable and detestable principles." Here we have the most extreme liberalist of his day—the man who professed, to quote the preamble of his bill, "that the right of private judgment in matters respecting religion is and ever must be the unalienable right of mankind, and as such ought always to be holden sacred and inviolable,"—nevertheless warmly advocating restrictions and exclusions on account of doctrinal opinions, and distinctly denouncing all Roman Catholics who would not repudiate the designation of Papists as undeserving of the privileges of free citizens. Nor was Lord Stanhope singular in entertaining these views. They were the common creed even of the most ardent friends of religious freedom at this date. Even Charles Fox expressed himself on the subject of the unlimited toleration of mere opinion with considerable hesitation.

The bill having been read a first time and ordered to be printed, the debate upon it was taken on the motion for the second reading, on the 9th of June. The motion was opposed by the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Bishop of Bangor (Warren), the Bishop of St. Asaph (Halifax), and, in a very clever speech, by Horsley, Bishop of St. David's. The most forcible objection urged against the measure was grounded upon the vagueness both of some of the propositions assumed in the preamble, and even of some of the enacting clauses. The Archbishop of Canterbury said, "that although he was ready to allow that there were on the statute-book some acts of a persecuting spirit in matters of religion, which had better be repealed, and was as willing as any man to

agree to their repeal, he could not but object to the present bill proceeding any farther."

In reply, Stanhope said he was determined to persevere with his measures of ecclesiastical reform in the face of whatever opposition ; and if the right reverend bench would not suffer him to remove their rubbish by cartsfull, he would endeavour to carry it off in wheelbarrows ; and if that mode of removal was resisted, he would, if possible, take it away, a little at a time, with a shovel. The question being then put, the motion for the second reading of the bill was negatived, apparently without a division. Stanhope immediately produced another bill, entitled " A Bill to repeal an Act of the 27th of Henry VIII., to prevent vexatious suits relative to prosecutions for tithes from the Quakers ;" but, after a short conversation, it was agreed that this measure should not be formally presented till another day. When, upon his lordship remarking that his second bill would probably meet with the same success as his first, Thurlow, nodding his black brows, seemed to scowl from the woolsack a cordial assent to that prediction, Stanhope exclaimed, " On another occasion I shall teach the noble and learned lord law as I have this day taught the bench of bishops religion." The debate on the Tithe Prosecutions Bill was taken on the 3rd of July, on the motion for its being committed. By the 7 and 8 of Will. III. c. 8, it had been enacted that small tithes, under the value of forty shillings, might be recovered by complaint to two justices of the peace ; by another statute (c. 34) of the same year the same regulation had been extended to all tithes, great or small, for which Quakers were liable, under the value of ten pounds ; and by the 1 Geo. I. stat. 2, c. 6, it was extended to all other dues or payments to the clergy, such as Easter dues, &c., withheld by persons of that persuasion. Ever since the passing of these laws, the manner in which tithes and other dues were usually recovered from Quakers had been by application to two justices of the peace, who ordered a distress to be made on the goods of the party. But recently, Lord Stanhope *stated*, some of the clergy had preferred seizing and im-

prisoning the persons of their Quaker debtors, under the 27 Hen. VIII. c. 20, which authorized parsons, vicars, or curates, by due process of the ecclesiastical laws, to convene any one refusing to pay his tithes, offerings, or other dues before his ordinary or other competent judge, who, for any contempt, contumacy, or disobedience, was to require the assistance of any two justices of the peace for the shire; and then such justices were empowered to attach the party's person, and commit him to ward, there to remain, without bail or mainprise, until he shall have found sufficient surety to give due obedience to the process, decrees, and sentences of the ecclesiastical court. Under this law a Quaker, a man of some property, had, about two months before, been incarcerated in the common gaol of Worcester, for refusing to pay a sum of five shillings, was there still, and to all appearance, if he did not desert his religious principles, must remain in confinement for life. At Coventry six Quakers had been lately prosecuted for Easter offerings, amounting to about fourpence each, and, having been brought into the spiritual court, had been subjected to such expenses as had swollen this original debt of two shillings to very nearly 300*l*. "But, as by their religion they never can pay," continued Stanhope, "nor any of the other Quakers for them, some of them have been excommunicated; the consequence of which is, that they cannot act as executors, that they cannot sue in any court to recover any debt due to them, and, in forty days after excommunication, they are liable to be sent to prison, there to remain till death shall deliver them from a gaol, where they may be dying for years, and perishing by inches; and this merely for the sake of a few pence; which few pence even might have been immediately recovered by means of the humane act of King William, had the priest thought fit." Some of these Quakers, his lordship added, were so highly respected at Coventry, that some of their neighbours who were not Quakers had raised money by subscription to stop all further proceedings against them; but this interference, he contended, would have the most fatal effects upon the whole body of Quakers for the fu-

ture, inasmuch as it would only serve to whet the avarice of the proctors of the spiritual court. His lordship expressed his willingness that the clergy should recover their tithes, even to the last farthing, but not by means that were tyrannical or vexatious: and he therefore proposed, in the present bill, to repeal the act of the 27th of Henry VIII., and to declare that no suit should hereafter be brought or be maintainable in any ecclesiastical court for the recovery of any tithes, dues, or other spiritual profits. Lord Kenyon, however, thought the 3rd of July too late in the session for the introduction of a bill which required the most serious discussion: to leave the right of the clergy to recover their tithes in the hands of a justice of the peace, he also said, was an arrangement not to be borne, and far worse than would be the abolition of tithes altogether. Lord Abingdon, too, delivered something like a sermon against the measure, which he was afraid might raise a conflagration that would endanger the whole fabric both of church and state—although he acquitted its author of any such design, expressing the highest opinion both of Stanhope's talents and of his goodness of heart, founded, as he stated, on his knowledge of him in former days, when they had been bred up together in the same seminary at Geneva; but he implored his old fellow-student not to persist in pointing out, as he was doing, to the numerous incendiaries in the country, how to throw all things into anarchy and confusion: on that subject he would say no more at present, but the times, he feared, were coming when he should be forced to speak out more plainly;—and, in the end, on the question being put, the motion for committing the bill was negatived, apparently without a division.

The next great discussion of this kind took place in the following session in the House of Commons, when the question of the repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts was once more brought forward on the 2nd of June, 1790. The motion, which was conceived in the same terms with that submitted in the preceding year by Mr. Beaufoy, was, on this occasion, made by Fox, who introduced it by a long speech. Fox, however, was

well aware that in the part he was now taking he had the feeling both of the House and of the country against him, and that the particular time chosen for urging this claim of the dissenters was generally considered the strongest objection to it. By all who apprehended danger to the existing institutions of the country, and were anxious for their preservation, such a movement at the present moment was regarded as merely a part of the warfare which they believed was about to be waged against whatever their patriotism or their prejudices held dearest and most sacred—as but a prelude to other attacks, which would be the more difficult to be repelled if this should succeed. Fox had admitted in his opening speech the temporary unpopularity to which he should probably subject himself by the course he was taking; and some remarkable indications in the course of the debate showed the extent and the powerful influence of the feeling which existed against the motion. First, one member, Mr. James Martin, member for Tewkesbury, rose and stated that, although the opinion which he had entertained in favour of the repeal remained unchanged, he yet felt himself obliged on the present occasion to vote against the motion in compliance with the positive instructions of his constituents; and afterwards, another member, Mr. Samuel Smith (who sat, we believe, for the city of Worcester), who had also voted with Beaufoy in the preceding session, made a declaration to the same effect. The result was what might have been anticipated from these and other symptoms: when the House divided, at a late hour, the motion was negatived by a majority nearly nine times as great as the last division had shown, the numbers being, ayes 105, noes 294. From the date of this quietus the question of the repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts, in so far as they affected the English dissenters, was no more heard of in parliament for many years after.

In the new parliament, however, which assembled in November, 1790, an attempt (but an unsuccessful one) was made to obtain an exemption from these law

for persons born in Scotland. On a division it was negatived by 149 votes against 62. Three-fifths of the House, it thus appears, had taken no interest in the question.

But, while nothing was effected by this attempt to extend the religious liberties of the Protestant dissenters, parliament had already during the present session consented somewhat to lighten the disabilities of another class of dissenters, whose grievances indeed were of a much more substantial kind. A considerable number of the English Roman Catholics had recently, with the view of allaying the chief apprehensions to which they seemed to owe their exclusion from the rights of citizenship, come forward with a declaration of their non-belief in certain doctrines, sometimes attributed to their church, namely, the doctrines that princes excommunicated by the pope might be justifiably deposed or murdered by their subjects; that no faith was to be kept with heretics; and that ecclesiastical absolution had the power to dissolve moral obligations. Those who made this declaration styled themselves *Protesting Roman Catholics*,—perhaps not without some notion of propitiating their Protestant fellow-subjects by the assumption of a name sounding a little like their own, though it may probably, at the same time, have had the effect of keeping back many of the more scrupulous among the members of their own communion, who would have joined them if they had not assumed so heretical-looking a designation. The position which a portion of the English Catholics had thus taken up, however, was thought to be likely to procure them some favour from the legislature; and, accordingly, on the 21st of February (1791), Mr. Mitford (afterwards Lord Redesdale) moved in the House of Commons for leave to bring in “a bill to relieve, upon conditions and under restrictions, persons called *Protesting Catholic Dissenters*, from certain penalties and disabilities to which Papists, or persons professing the Popish religion, are by law subject.” Mr. Mitford observed that, in *Burn’s ‘Ecclesiastical Law,’* no less a space than seventy

pages was occupied with an enumeration of the penal statutes that were still in force against Roman Catholics. What he proposed to do now was to pass a measure in favour of the English Protestant Catholics, which would give them the same relief that had been accorded to the Catholics of Ireland by an act passed by the parliament of that kingdom eight or nine years before. The Irish act alluded to is the 21 and 22 Geo. III. c. 24, passed in 1782, for the relief of persons professing the popish religion, who should have taken an oath prescribed in a previous act, the 13 and 14 Geo. III. c. 35, entitled "An Act to enable his majesty's subjects, of whatever persuasion, to testify their allegiance to him;" which oath, omitting the recognition of the king's ecclesiastical supremacy and the abjuration of that of the pope, bound the party taking it only to the rejection of the opinions, that it is lawful to murder any person on pretence of his being a heretic—that no faith is to be kept with heretics—that princes, when excommunicated, may be deposed or murdered, and to the usual affirmation touching the non-existence of any temporal or civil jurisdiction within this realm in the pope or any other foreign power. By the act of 1782, Roman Catholics who should have taken this oath were declared qualified in Ireland to acquire by purchase, descent, or otherwise, and to dispose of by will, any lands or other heritable property, except advowsons, or manors, or parliamentary boroughs; and were also relieved from the 8 Anne, c. 3, subjecting them to fine and imprisonment for not testifying when they heard mass; from the 7 Will. III. c. 5, and 8 Anne, c. 3, making it unlawful for them to keep horses of the value of 5*l.*; from the 9 Geo. II. c. 6, imposing amercements on papists for robberies by privateers; from the 6 Geo. I. c. 10, compelling a papist, when elected a watchman, to find a Protestant watchman in his stead; and from the 2 Anne, c. 6, forbidding them to inhabit Limerick or Galway: and popish ecclesiastics taking the oath within six months, and registering their names and abodes, were discharged of all penalties imposed by the 9 Will. III. c. 1., and the 2 Anne, c. 6

& 7, provided they should not be convicted of officiating in a church with a steeple or bell, or at any funeral in a church or church-yard, or of performing any of the rites or ceremonies of the popish religion, or wearing the habits of their orders, excepting in their usual places of worship or in private families, or of using any symbol of ecclesiastical authority, or assuming any ecclesiastical rank or title. The benefits of the act, however, were not to extend to any one who should have been converted, or, as it was expressed, perverted, from the Protestant religion, nor to popish ecclesiastics who should endeavour to pervert any Protestant. We may here also mention that by another Irish act of the same year, the 21 and 22 Geo. III. c. 32, Roman Catholics taking the above-mentioned oath were allowed to keep schools, notwithstanding the 7 Will. III. c. 4, and the 8 Anne, c. 3, provided they did not receive any Protestant among their scholars, and also provided that they had the authority of the ordinary of the diocese, which he might recall whenever he thought proper; and the right of being guardians to their own children, or to those of any other person of their communion, was granted to all Roman Catholics, except ecclesiastics, notwithstanding the 14 and 15 Char. II. c. 14, the 6 Will. III. c. 3, and the 2 Anne, c. 4.* These two bills had been introduced into the Irish House of Commons by Mr. Gardiner (afterwards Lord Mountjoy); and they had been carried through mainly per force of the enthusiasm on the one hand, and the alarm on the other, excited by the volunteer associations. Even these influences, however, had not proved powerful enough to secure the success of a third bill which Gardiner proposed, for permitting marriages between Protestants and Catholics. Mr. Mitford's bill for the relief of the English Protestant Roman Catholics contained an oath to be taken by those who were to receive the benefit of the measure, very nearly of the same tenor

* This latter part of the act was explained and amended by a subsequent Irish act passed in 1790, the 30 Geo. III. c. 29.

with that in the Irish act of the 13 and 14 Geo. III. c. 35 ; and it enacted that no Catholic taking such oath should be prosecuted as a recusant, on any of the old statutes of Elizabeth and James,* for not resorting to church or keeping any servant not so resorting ; nor on any of the statutes of Elizabeth, James I., Charles I., and Charles II.,† for being a papist, or reputed papist, or for professing or being educated in the popish religion, or for hearing or saying mass, or being a priest or deacon, or entering or belonging to any ecclesiastical order or community of the Catholic religion ; or being present at or performing, or assisting in the performance or administration of, any rite, ceremony, practice, or observance of the popish religion. It relieved all Catholics taking the oath from the liability to be removed from London, under the 3 Will. and Mary, c. 9 ; from the penalties they incurred, if peers, under the 30 Char. II., by coming into the presence of the king ; and from their obligation of having their deeds and wills registered, according to the 3 Geo. I. c. 18. It enacted that no Roman Catholic should be liable to be summoned to take either the oath of supremacy contained in the 1 Will. and Mary, stat. 1, c. 8, or the declaration against transubstantiation in the 25 Chas. II. c. 2 ; and it permitted Catholics to practise as barristers or attorneys without taking these oaths, provided they took the new oath prescribed in the bill. These clauses, however, did not open the doors of either House of Parliament to Roman Catholics, who were still bound to take the old oaths in all cases (excepting those specified in the bill) in which that was necessary for the acceptance of any place or office, or the performance of any function ; as it was to enable any one to take his seat either in the House of Commons or in the House of

* The statutes enumerated were the 1 Eliz. c. 2, the 23 Eliz. c. 1, the 29 Eliz. c. 6, the 35 Eliz. c. 2, the 2 (vulgo 1) Jac. I. c. 4, the 3 Jac. I. c. 4 & 5, and the 7 Jac. I. c. 5.

† These were the 23 Eliz. c. 1, the 27 Eliz. c. 2, the 35 Eliz. c. 2, the 2 (vulgo 1) Jac. I. c. 4, the 3 Jac. I. c. 5, the 3 Char. I. c. 2, and the 25 Char. II. c. 2.

Lords. The oath of supremacy, too, might still be tendered to any person presenting himself to vote at the election of a member of parliament. The bill further legalized Roman Catholic places of worship, provided they were registered and the door kept unlocked during the time of service; and it also, like the late Irish act, removed the penalties against Catholics for acting as teachers, on condition, however, that they received no children of Protestant fathers among their scholars. They were specially prohibited, too, from keeping school in Oxford or Cambridge.

The next session of parliament was distinguished by the passing of a bill for the relief of another description of dissenters, "the pastors, ministers, and lay persons of the Episcopal communion in Scotland." Ever since the Revolution of 1688 the Scottish Episcopalians had been regarded by the law as a body hostile to the established government, and had themselves in general maintained an attitude of alienation towards the new order of things. The act of Queen Anne, passed in 1712, indeed, had given to the Episcopal church a toleration and legal existence in Scotland which it had not had for the preceding twenty-four years, and had enabled its pastors to perform their religious functions without impediment from the Presbyterian clergy.* But, after more than thirty years of comparative freedom from molestation, the conduct of many of the Scottish Episcopalians during the rebellion of 1745 again drew upon them the eye of the government; and, immediately after the suppression of that attempt, parliament passed an act (the 19 Geo. II. c. 38), "more effectually to prohibit and prevent pastors or ministers from officiating in Episcopal meeting-houses in Scotland without duly qualifying themselves according to law, and to punish persons for resorting to any meeting-houses where such unqualified pastors or ministers shall officiate."

In the Commons this same session an important debate took place on a motion made pursuant to notice by Mr.

* See Pict. Hist. of England iv. 648.

Fox, on the 11th of May, for leave to bring in a bill to repeal and alter sundry provisions of certain penal statutes respecting religious opinions; namely, that of the 1st of Edward VI. c. 1, entitled "An Act against such as shall unreverently speak against the Sacrament of the Altar, and of the receiving thereof under both kinds;" the 1st of Mary, st. 2, c. 2, entitled "An Act against Offenders of Preachers and other Ministers in the Church;" certain statutes of Elizabeth against the Roman Catholics not included in the late repeal;* and the 9 and 10 of William III., c. 32, entitled "An Act, for the more effectual Suppressing of Blasphemy and Profaneness." In the first instance the motion appears to have been confined to the repeal of the last-mentioned act only. It had been preceded by the presentation of a petition from the Unitarians, against whose denial of the Trinity that statute was principally levelled, or rather, indeed, particularly directed.

The motion was negatived by a majority of more than two to one—the numbers being, ayes 63, noes 142.

The next session of the same parliament, nevertheless, was distinguished by the extension to the Roman Catholics of Scotland of the same measure of relief which had already been granted to those of Ireland and of England.

Two or three minor matters still remain to be noticed. Among these may be first mentioned the successive attempts that were made to give additional strictness or efficiency to the law for the observance of the Sabbath. The first bill with this object was brought forward in the House of Commons by Mr. Mainwaring, in March, 1794: in the short speech with which he introduced the subject he dwelt principally on the expediency of raising the amount of the penalties inflicted by the existing statutes; and the measure appears to have been defeated, or dropped, without much farther debate. A similar bill which was introduced in the

* They are described in the report of the debate as statutes of the "14th and 15th of Eliz., &c. &c." But there were no such statutes made in these years.

next session reached a second reading, the motion to that effect being carried on the 26th of March, 1795, by a majority of 25 to 21; but the motion for committing it was negatived on the 13th of April following, by 44 to 43. From the report of a short debate which took place on the motion for the second reading, it appears that one of the provisions of the bill went to substitute fine and imprisonment for the pecuniary penalties of the old law, and another to constitute the offence of violating the Sabbath a misdemeanor, subjecting the party to an indictment. On the other hand it was argued that the existing law had been ineffectual. Mr. Eliot observed, that the observance of the Sabbath was notoriously declining: "in the present year the building of great edifices was carried on openly, and in defiance of decency, on a Sunday. Another circumstance which was very offensive in the eye of decorum was, the great number of public waggons which travelled the road on a Sunday. Some few years ago no such thing as a public waggon was seen on the road on the Sabbath-day, whereas nothing was now more common." These statements afford materials for comparison with the state of things at the present day, and may be taken as proving that the decorum of the Sunday is at least as well observed now as it was half a century ago. Mr. Courtenay urged another objection to the bill: "under pretence," he observed, "of enforcing a stricter observance of the Lord's Day by the middling and lower class of people, it gave licence to another numerous set of men to break in upon that observance in a manner which they were restricted from by the act of Charles II. In pursuance of that act, and by the common law, no bailiff or sheriff's officer could execute any writ, process, or execution on a Sunday. By this act they were empowered to execute all such processes for offences committed on that day." Even limited as it appears to have been, this was certainly a most dangerous proviso, and would probably have violated and impaired the sacredness of the Sabbath, considered as the one day in seven of universal rest, and freedom, and security.

more seriously than all the other abuses the bill was intended to put down. Among the members who supported the general principle of the bill, however, some, such as Pitt and the Master of the Rolls, expressed themselves as opposed to several of its enactments. After this failure no further attempt of the same kind appears to have been made for some years. But a part of the subject was again brought before the House of Commons in 1799, by Lord Belgrave, who, on the 27th of May in that year, moved for and obtained leave to bring in a bill "for the suppression of the sale and the circulation of newspapers on the Lord's Day." In the speech with which he introduced his motion, Lord Belgrave stated that Sunday newspapers first appeared about the year 1780; "but they had not met with much success till within the last year or two, when a paper called the 'Observer' had got into a considerable circulation." Much expectation had also lately been excited by the announcement of an additional Sunday newspaper, to be entitled the 'Volunteer.' The sale of a newspaper, as of any other article on a Sunday, was indeed already contrary to law; it was punishable by a penalty of five shillings and the forfeiture of the article; "but the forfeiture, in fact, amounted to nothing, on account of the manner in which it was to be sued for, and the penalty was evidently too small. He should propose to increase the penalty from 5s. to 40s. If it applied to the whole sale, he would propose 20l. on the sale of the article altogether; and, in respect to the circulation of these newspapers, he would propose to make it a breach of the peace, and the person found circulating them liable to instant commitment by any magistrate, or peace-officer, or churchwarden." The motion that this bill should be read a second time on the Wednesday following was carried on the 30th of May, after a short debate, by a majority of 25 to 22; but, when it was moved on the 11th of June that it should be read a second time then (the order of the day to that effect having apparently been postponed from the said Wednesday), the motion was supported only by 28

votes against 40; and the bill was accordingly lost. At this time, it may be gathered from the debates on this measure, the Sunday newspapers found it expedient to recommend themselves to their readers by making their leading articles a sort of religious discourses. Lord Belgrave, in one of his speeches in support of the bill, said, "It had been pleaded, in extenuation, that the Sunday papers contained sermons, &c.; but, so far from this being a recommendation, he considered it as an evil, inasmuch as it induced people to neglect going to church."

The proceedings on a measure for the relief of the Quakers, which was first brought forward in parliament by Mr. Sergeant Adair, in April, 1796, afford some curious illustration of the state of opinion at the time. Having, on the 21st of April, presented a petition, described as from the people called Quakers, in which it was set forth that seven of their brethren were then prisoners in the gaol of York for non-payment of tithes, and the House was requested to bestow a serious consideration on their case, and grant such relief as might appear proper, Adair, on the 26th, moved for leave to bring in a bill for that purpose. The measure, he explained, in so far as this part of its object was concerned, would consist simply in extending the provisions of an act of the 7 and 8 of William III. from the case of tithes of the amount of 10*l.* to that of tithes of any amount. By the act of William tithes to the amount of 10*l.* might be recovered from a Quaker by distraint upon his goods under the order of a justice of peace; and this had been ever since the plan generally followed in enforcing payment of such tithes. When the amount, however, was higher than 10*l.*, the tithes could only be recovered by process in the ecclesiastical courts, or in the court of exchequer, and, if he refused to make payment, by arrest and incarceration of the party. This distinction the bill proposed to do away with, bringing the recovery of tithes generally under the principle of the act of William; and it was also provided by another *clause that the solemn affirmation of a Quaker should be*

evidence in criminal cases, in the same way as it already was in civil cases. The Quakers, it appears, at this date did not object to being compelled to pay tithes by the seizure and sale of their goods; they would not voluntarily be parties to the payment, but all they complained of was, that the law allowed payment to be enforced, in certain cases, by the seizure of their persons as well as of their goods. Mr. Wilberforce was the first to rise, after Adair had sat down, and to express his hearty approbation of the principle of the bill; and he was followed to the same effect by Pitt, Sir William Dolben, and other members. The only member who made any objection to the measure was the ultra-Whig Francis, who doubted whether in some cases the scruples founded on religious considerations against the payment of tithes might not be professed where they were not seriously felt by persons hoping to pass for victims or martyrs; "and then, generally, whether it might not deserve consideration, how far it might be safe for the legislature to encourage the plea of religious scruples against obedience to the laws, how far that indulgent principle ought to be carried, and by what general limit it ought to be confined in its application." Even Francis, however, thought that undoubtedly the public ought to have the benefit of the evidence of Quakers in criminal trials, as proposed by the bill. In the end the motion was unanimously agreed to; and the bill, having been brought in the next day, appears to have proceeded without encountering any opposition till the 10th of May, when, on the order of the day being read for going into committee upon it, Francis again rose and called the attention of the House to what he described as the fact, that the scruples of conscience on which the measure professed to be founded "did not proceed from the individuals themselves, but from the operation of a higher power, which, at the yearly meeting, prescribed rules and orders in the manner of a government, and excommunicated the persons who did not obey them." Other objections were also started by one or two members, both now and on the

second reading ; but no serious opposition was attempted, and the bill was passed by the Commons on the 14th, and the day following read a first time in the Lords. On the 16th, however, when the order of the day for the second reading was read, the Archbishop of Canterbury (Moore) rose and observed that the bill involved a question of right of very great importance, and had been introduced at so late a period of the session, that he should move that it be read a second time that day three months ; and, after a few words from the Duke of Norfolk, the Bishop of Rochester, and the Lord Chancellor, this motion was agreed to. The measure was consequently lost for the present session and the present parliament. But it was the first subject brought forward in the House of Commons, after the address of thanks, in the new parliament, which assembled in the beginning of October. On the 17th of that month leave to bring in another bill containing the same provisions with the former, was moved for by Mr. Sergeant Adair, in a short speech, in which he again explained to his new hearers the grounds and objects of the measure. "The Quakers," he said, "did not object to the payment of tithes, provided they were not made active in their obedience to the law by which tithes were claimed of them ; but their scruples of conscience led them to think it a breach of the divine law for them to be active in their obedience to a civil institution which they considered as repugnant to divine authority ; and, as our law now stood, the process might be such as to compel them to be thus active against their conscience : they, therefore, were subject to perpetual imprisonment when an attachment was issued against their persons for the non-payment of tithes." The motion, which was seconded by Mr. Abbot (afterwards speaker, then newly become a member of the House), was agreed to ; and the bill, being brought in, was read a first and second time without encountering any opposition. But when the order of the day for going into committee upon it was read, on the 24th of February, 1797, a brisk fire was opened upon it. Adair

had laid himself somewhat open by at least some of the grounds on which he had advocated the measure, and advantage was taken of his unguarded expressions with eminent dialectic skill by Sir William Scott (afterwards Lord Stowel), in a speech in opposition to the motion, "That the Speaker do now leave the chair." The present bill professed to be brought in for the relief of the Quakers, and to be the same in principle with the act of the 7 and 8 of William III.; but Scott, having desired that statute to be read, contended that so far from its intention being to relieve the Quakers from the persecution of other men, it was manifestly meant to relieve other men from the persecution of the Quakers—it was an additional means or power given to the tithe-owner to recover his property in certain cases from those who detained it from him under the pretence of religious scruples. But the present bill had also been recommended on the ground that it would facilitate the recovery of tithes. "If the Quakers really held it unlawful to pay tithes, how came they to apply for a bill, the object of which was to facilitate the recovery of them? The argument stood thus:—'The Quakers considered themselves as unjustifiable in paying tithes, except they were compelled; the House was, therefore, desired to accommodate the mode of compulsion to their wishes. He then put the case either way—that they did pay tithes at present without compulsion, or that they did not. If they did not, their refusal was a persecution of the holder of tithes, and the remedy ought to be a prompt and efficacious one, otherwise the tithe-owner would be an owner, not of tithes, but of suits. The fact, however, he believed to be notoriously otherwise, and that the Quaker at present paid tithes, not from actual compulsion, but under the apprehension of compulsion. Since this was the case, why should the remedy be placed at a greater distance, and thus rendered less prompt and less efficacious?' Then as for the actual sufferings of the Quakers from the existing law, Scott maintained that they were of the most insignificant amount. From inquiries which he had instituted, he

had ascertained that for the last twenty years there had not been one prosecution for tithes carried on against a Quaker in the diocese of Canterbury; that in the diocese of Bristol one had been commenced, in consequence of which the tithes were immediately paid; that there had been one in the diocese of Lichfield and Coventry against six Quakers, but that no imprisonment had taken place; and that in the diocese of Worcester there had been only one, in consequence of which the Quaker was imprisoned, but he was liberated owing to an error in the writ. There had, besides, been some, but very few, in the Court of Exchequer during the same period. In answer to this speech Adair found it necessary to explain that the Quakers had not petitioned for the particular relief provided by his bill. "The Quakers had petitioned for relief as to the imprisonment of their persons. In his situation as a member of parliament, he was to consider what was wise and proper to be done, not what was agreeable to the wishes of the petitioners. The Quakers were not answerable for what the bill contained; he alone was responsible for its contents." It may be doubted, however, if the case was much advanced in the favour of the House by the obtrusion of this delicate distinction between the active and the passive in the grammar of morality, which seemed to be so great a favourite with the Quakers, but which would sound to ordinary ears very like a distinction merely between principle and prudence, between manliness and sneaking, between honesty and roguery. When the question was put it was found that the numbers were equal, 33 on each side; but the Speaker, though against his own opinion, gave his casting vote in favour of the motion, and the House went into committee. The bill, however, rapidly lost favour; and at length, on the 6th of March, it was thrown out by a vote in which the noes numbered 28 and the ayes no more than 12.

The only other matter connected with the history of religion that remains to be noticed under the present period, is a measure styled the *Monastic Institutions Bill*, which was brought forward in 1800. On the 22nd

of May in that year, the House of Commons having resolved itself into a committee of the whole House to consider the late act passed for the relief of the Roman Catholics in 1791, Sir Henry Paulet St. John Mildmay, one of the members for Westbury, rose to move certain resolutions, which he stated had been suggested to him by his local residence in a populous city (Winchester), in which many of the priests and other emigrants from France had taken up their abode. He professed to be highly gratified with the humane and hospitable reception that had been given in England during the last ten years to these unfortunate exiles, who had preferred expulsion from their native country, and the sacrifice of all their temporal interests, to the abandonment of their religious principles; and he also admitted that they, on their part, had generally justified the protection they had met with by their peaceful demeanour and their unassuming and unobtrusive gratitude. Nor would he interfere with the free practice of their religion by the Roman Catholic emigrants, so long as it was so conducted as not to be inconsistent with the safety of the church and state. "The various asylums," he continued, "with which this country abounds for the reception of these unfortunate fugitives are highly to the honour of this country; but however to our honour it may be to have afforded protection to such individuals, and to have tolerated them in the private exercise of their religious duties, I cannot conceive that it ever was the intention of government to encourage the permanent re-establishment of monastic institutions in this Protestant country. However to our honour it may be to have suffered those individuals who had previously bound themselves to the duties of a monastic life to discharge in this country those vows whence, in their mind, no human power could release them, I think such indulgence ought to expire with the life of the present incumbents; that we ought not to suffer the vacancies which may happen to rise in such communities to be filled up by subjects of this country actually professed since their residence here; and that we should on all grounds carefully guard against the admis-

sion of any new members into these societies, whose first obligation on entering into them is subversive of those laws and liberties which the wisdom and policy of our ancestors long since introduced amongst us. It falls within my own observation to know that, in each of the two monastic societies established at Winchester, several different persons have been suffered actually to profess themselves, and to take both veils, since their residence there; and a great variety of similar instances might be produced, from different parts of the country, where these monastic societies have been established." He did not mean to assert that such proceedings had as yet gone to any alarming extent, but he thought they ought to be checked in the bud; else the time might come when it would be lamented that parliament, by voting money for the subsistence of the emigrants, had in some degree made itself a party to the revival of what seemed to Protestants "the most unnatural part of the Romish faith." Another subject to which he wished to call attention was the recent foundation throughout England of a great number of Roman Catholic schools, many of them engrafted on and under the immediate superintendence of the monastic establishments. To each of the two monasteries established at Winchester was annexed a school for the education of female children, which was not in existence previous to the institution of these convents. "I am a friend," said Sir Henry, "to toleration in matters of conscience; but I think that, having admitted 5000 priests into this country, of a persuasion inimical to the religion established by law, and continuing to subsist here at the public expense, it is our duty to be particularly careful to give no offence to the regular church, and to see that the interests of the Protestant communion do not suffer by our humanity and indulgence. I do not say that, in either of the two instances to which I have adverted, the children of Protestant parents have been admitted into these seminaries, though I could prove that they have been admitted elsewhere: but I do say that such attempts have been made; and, if they have not succeeded, it has been entirely owing to the

strict and steady principles of those on whom the experiment has been tried." The existing laws did, in some degree, provide against this last danger; but not, he thought, sufficiently. To meet the whole evil, he therefore moved the two following resolutions: 1. "That it is the opinion of this committee, that the temporary residence in this kingdom of certain monastic societies should be permitted, subject to the provisions of an act passed in the 31st of his present majesty, intituled, &c. (the Roman Catholic Relief Act of 1791); and that the admission of any new members into such societies should be prohibited; and that the names and numbers of the persons belonging thereto should be annually returned to the court of quarter-sessions of the county in which they reside. 2. That all persons undertaking the public education of youth in the Romish faith should also return annually to the court a list containing the names and number of their pupils, together with the names and places of abode of their respective parents; and that a power be given to magistrates appointed by the quarter-sessions to inspect such institutions at pleasure." These resolutions, the first of which was borrowed from a regulation in the act passed for the government of Canada in 1763, were of course submitted for the purpose of being embodied in a bill. They were agreed to after a very short debate, in which one member, Mr. Hobhouse, having expressed his opinion that the Alien Act possessed all the power that was necessary to prevent the abuses complained of, Pitt replied that "he could not agree that an act which enabled government to turn out of the kingdom any person whom it might suspect of designs against the tranquillity of the kingdom, could with propriety be enforced in the case under consideration." As for the resolutions, he professed to admire the liberal principles on which they were framed: "they did not infringe on the principles of toleration sanctioned by the laws and constitution of this country: it was no part of those principles to allow the establishment of monastic institutions." The next day, when the resolutions were reported, Mr. Windham objected to the proposed measure as being

altogether unnecessary, and as having no other recommendation than that it would do no harm; but the report was agreed to by the House, and a bill in pursuance of the resolutions ordered to be brought in, which it accordingly was by Sir Henry Mildmay on the 5th of June. It was read a second time on the 11th, without any debate that has been recorded; but on the 23rd, when the order of the day was read for going into committee upon it, the motion was opposed by Windham in a speech of some length. The strain of his first objection preserves a curious reminiscence of the state of the public mind in England at the moment in reference to much more momentous matters than modern monachism. "Could it be believed," he exclaimed, "that at the present moment especially, when the powers of Europe were trembling in the scale, awaiting the decision of a day, perhaps an hour, when the next dispatch, perhaps, will bring accounts of some battle, on the issue of which may depend the fate of revolutionary France;—at a moment when those priests, from whom some gentlemen appear to dread so much, are looking eagerly forward to the near approach of their delivery, and of their return to their native soil, to take possession of all their honours;—was it at such a moment that the House of Commons of Great Britain thought fit to apprehend serious dangers to the religious faith of the people of England from the progress of Catholic opinion?" Alas for this sanguine speculation! Nine days before the words were uttered the battle of Marengo had been already fought (although the disastrous news had not yet reached this country), and Piedmont and Austrian Italy were now at the feet of the victorious French republic. Windham proceeded to combat what he treated as the exaggerated prejudices commonly entertained against the Roman Catholic religion, and monasteries in particular. "He could not see why monks were to be considered worse than the gentlemen of that House, who lived on their estates without labour. Might not a society of ancient ladies be as usefully employed in a convent as if they were distributed in parties at different

card-tables?" As for the taking of vows that had been spoken of, he believed the fact to be, that the only persons who took their vows in this country were such as had served their noviciate, or the greater part of it, on the continent. "Thus, then, no acquisition was made from the natives of Great Britain; and, as to the alarm about converts, he could only say that the church must increase its diligence, if it had relaxed it. The divines of the established church should feed their flocks with spiritual food, and thus enable them to withstand the poison of delusion. Instead of this, they are too fond of raising the cry that the church is in danger. If proselytism exists, it is a disgrace only to the clergyman in whose parish it takes place. What, if they do their duty, can members of the church of England fear? They meet their antagonists on more than equal terms. Should any one, indeed, attempt to preach up the 'Rights of Man,' or teach insubordination to lawful authority, to silence him would be a work of necessity; but popery has nothing in it of this dangerous tendency, and may be met fairly in the field of argument." "Penal laws," he afterwards said, "can never defend the country against popery. I cannot help making the remark here, that opinion may be too much under the protection of law. A little opposition is no bad thing; it makes persons attentive to their duty, and may be as useful in the church as in the senate." In reply to this speech Mildmay defended his bill in the best way he could. It introduced no new principle, he contended, into the criminal law of the country. The establishment of monastic communities was distinctly prohibited in the Relief Bill of 1791, the motion for bringing in which Windham himself had seconded in a speech replete with the most satisfactory arguments. He spoke of an opposition to the measure which had been industriously fomented out of doors; but this, he said, was, in his mind, an additional reason why the House should adopt it. "Can it be expected," he asked, "that we are to sit still, and tamely see the constitution of this country undermined by a set of men whom we have received here from motives of compassion?"

and to take no steps to prevent it, merely from the apprehension of inflaming the public mind against the Catholics?" The professions of the superiors of the Roman Catholic schools themselves, he observed, and their own advertisements, showed that they undertook indiscriminately the education both of children of their own communion and of those of Protestant parents; and in some instances they professed to educate the children of the indigent gratuitously. "This," said Mildmay, "appears to me to be offering bribes and temptations to obtain the instruction of Protestant children; and, so long as we profess the Reformed religion, such practices ought not to be suffered. I am in possession of an official letter from the Bishop of St. Pol de Leon to the Bishop of Winchester, in consequence of very heavy complaints that were made by his lordship to the French bishop on the subject to which I have called the attention of the House. In his answer, the Bishop of Leon does not apologise for the conduct of the emigrants, but tells us distinctly that he considers them perfectly justified under the letter of our existing laws." The Hon. Dudley Ryder (afterwards Earl of Harrowby) also spoke in favour of the measure, which he maintained was "an enabling bill, and not a bill to coerce, to restrain, and to punish." The existence of monasteries in this country was already directly contrary to several statutes. The present bill—his only objection to which was that it carried toleration too far—"would operate as a protection to the Catholics, and would reconcile the populace to their residence in Great Britain." On the other side, Mr. (afterwards Sir Benjamin) Hobhouse, then sitting for Bletchingley, delivered a speech of some length, from which we may glean a few facts. He commenced by asserting that it had been the policy of our law to inflict penalties and disabilities upon persons professing the Roman Catholic faith, not on account of their religious tenets, but on account of their political opinions only. The Roman Catholics among our own subjects had now, with very few exceptions, entitled themselves to the *benefits* of the act of 1791, by making the declaration

therein prescribed. In regard to the foreign monastic establishments that had been transferred to this country, and the schools or seminaries connected with them, Mr. Hobhouse made the following statement:—"The societies of English ladies who were bound by religious vows abroad, and who have resided in this country since 1794, consisted of seventeen in number, and contained, in the whole, rather more than 200 persons, including a few French or Flemish servants. Those ladies were, for the most part, sprung from some of the most respectable families in the kingdom. The societies of foreign ladies were four in number, and consisted of about 50 individuals. Of male societies there were only four, three of which were entirely composed of English from Douay and Bornhem. With respect to the French emigrant clergy, probably not 500, out of the 5000 now in England, belonged to any religious order." Nor was it probable that any increase was taking place in the numbers of the persons of either sex, resident in England, who were thus bound by monastic vows: of the women, at least, it had been ascertained that 60 had died since 1794, and only 20 had been added in their room. As for property, they had none, or next to none. "They lost their houses and moveables by the violence of our enemies. Their funds, which were lodged in the Bank of Vienna, our magnanimous ally the emperor had seized, and transferred the poor wanderers over to our charity and compassion. To the bounty of individuals, and the money they received for the education of children, they were indebted for their subsistence. . . . It was certainly true that many of them took pupils, but they confined themselves to the children of Roman Catholics, conformably to the injunctions of the law. He had the authority of the most respectable abbesses and directors for saying, that they never knowingly admitted the child of any Protestant. Only two instances had occurred in which this rule was violated; but both were the result of deception; and, the moment the children were discovered to belong to Protestant parents, they were dismissed." The fact was, he afterwards stated, that "the

Roman Catholic families, who used to send their children abroad for education, now placed them for the purposes of instruction in these religious houses." After the delivery of this speech, which was well calculated to make an impression on the House, or on the country, Sir William Scott spoke from the ministerial side against the bill, although he desired, he said, to prevent the extension of the schools and monastic institutions, and was favourable to the adoption of some temporary regulations for that purpose; and he was followed by Mr. (afterwards Lord) Erskine, from the ranks of the Whig opposition, in support of the measure. Scott admitted that the accounts that had been given of the numbers of the monastic persons, although they rested on general assertion, and could not be received as absolutely correct till confirmed by official returns, were probably very near the truth; but "with respect to the males," he observed, "there was one fallacy, which he wished to detect. These institutions were looked on as consisting of monks, whereas they were composed either of secular priests exclusively, or of secular priests and religieux, a distinct description of persons from those in the contemplation of the bill." Erskine argued that, looking to the nature of the title by which the reigning family sat on the throne, it was impossible to brush away at once all the legal disabilities to which the Roman Catholics remained subject; "but, as to the bill itself, although it took caution against the growth of Catholic influence, it would, if passed into law, be an enabling statute, as without it these foreign Catholics would be subject to severities from which they would now be exempted. Monasteries, since the Reformation, were not English institutions; they could not be retired from view, like Protestant establishments. The worship of their votaries was not only open to the magistrates, but to all who chose to be present; and, if they barred their doors, they were subject to all the penalties of the ancient laws. . . . Without the bill these foreigners could not have remained a single hour in England, independently of the Alien Act, without a licence from the crown; and he could not

therefore but insist that, if it passed into a law, it would be an enabling statute, because, though the licence was still necessary, yet, when thus sanctioned and encouraged by parliament, its permanent operation was certain." In fact, however, if the royal licence Erskine talked of was really required, it was in the circumstances sure to be granted, without hesitation and as a matter of course, whether the present bill should be passed or not. Sheridan, who spoke next, without meddling with his friend Erskine's law, deprecated the measure in strong terms, as "fraught with everything that must insult the pride and alarm the feelings of the Roman Catholics of this country." "As to the objects of the bill," he observed, "or rather those who were supposed to be the objects of it, there was no power to remove them, for they were natural-born subjects of this realm, and could not be put under the operation of the Alien Act." The motion for going into committee, however, after a few words in its support from Mr. Perceval, was carried by a majority of 52 to 24; and the bill was accordingly committed the next day, and on the 4th of July it was read a third time and passed. It was now ordered to be entitled "An Act to prevent any addition to the number of persons belonging to certain foreign religious Orders, or Communities, lately settled in this Kingdom, and to regulate the Education of Youth by such persons."

Being now sent up to the Lords, the bill was read there a first and second time without opposition; but, on the motion for committing it, Horsley, now transferred to the see of Rochester, opened the attack upon it in a speech of great ability, force, and clearness. His objection to the measure he declared to be, that in one respect it was unnecessary, and in another unconstitutional. "It is unnecessary," he said, "as a means of security against the dangers it foresees, not because the apprehension is altogether groundless, but because the security is already provided by the existing laws; and, in regard to the new power which it would give to the crown, it is perfectly unconstitutional." On the subject of the existing laws relating to Roman Catholics, he

observed, in the first place, that they all applied equally, without any difference or discrimination, to the natural-born subjects of his majesty and to aliens. So also did the statutes that had been recently passed for the relief of the Roman Catholics from some penalties, upon certain conditions. Further, by these late statutes not one of the old penal statutes was repealed (except, indeed, certain clauses in an act of the 11 and 12 of William III., subjecting any popish ecclesiastic who should say mass, or any papist who should keep a school, to perpetual imprisonment, granting a reward of 100*l.* for the conviction of a popish ecclesiastic, and creating certain disabilities of taking lands by descent, devise, or limitation; which were repealed by the act of 1778). The act of 1791 only declared that any Roman Catholic who should have subscribed a certain oath and declaration should no longer be liable to prosecution for certain overt acts of popery therein named: if he refused or neglected to take and subscribe the said oath and declaration, the unrepealed statutes still remained in full force against him. What then were the restraints imposed by these statutes? By the 3 Jac. I. cap. 4, §§ 22 and 23, and also by the 23 Eliz. cap. 1, it was high treason for any person within the king's dominions either to reconcile or to be reconciled to the pope or see of Rome. No person, indeed, who had complied with the conditions of the act of 1791 could now be prosecuted for being reconciled to Rome; but Horsley maintained that there was nothing in that act, or in any other upon the statute-book, which affected the offence of converting or attempting to convert any other person to the popish faith: that was still high treason. But, after all, this was not one of the dangers against which the bill pretended to provide. It was principally directed against the danger apprehended from the impunity given by the act of 1791 to Roman Catholic tutors and schoolmasters, and of which it was supposed that the fugitives from France might avail themselves. Horsley admitted it to be the fact that among these fugitives were many regulars of both sexes. "The monks, however," he said, "are very few; and

the far greater proportion both of monks and nuns are the natural-born subjects of his majesty—English monks and English nuns, who were settled in convents of their own in France and Flanders, because they could make no such settlement in their own country. . . . With these some French monastics of both sexes have made their escape; and they are now all settled in different parts of the country, in houses in which the remaining members of each convent live in common.” The communities of monks were, one of English Benedictines, settled at Acton Burnell, near Shrewsbury; another of the same order, at Vernon Hall, near Liverpool; one of English Franciscans, near Northallerton; and one of English Dominicans, at Carshalton, in Surrey. The individuals collected in these four establishments were no more than 26 in number; and these, with the addition of five Cistercians of the order of La Trappe, settled near Wareham, and five Carthusians near Wardour Castle, made the sum total of monks, English and French, settled in England. The nuns were more numerous, consisting of the surviving members of 22 convents in all, of which eighteen were English and only four French. The English houses the right reverend prelate did not enumerate: the French he stated to be, the Bernardine Dames, from the Abbey Desprez at Douay, settled at Pentonville, near Islington; the ladies of the order of St. Francis de Sales, settled near Little Chelsea; the Benedictine Dames of Montargis, at Bodney Hall, in Norfolk; and the Hospitalières of Cambray, at or near Ilford, in Essex. Altogether, the number of nuns, both French and English, certainly did not exceed 360 persons. “My lords,” continued Horsley, “all these persons (with the exception of the ten French monks*) have qualified themselves to be teachers of youth according to the statute of the 81st of the king; and they have opened schools at their respective habitations—the monks for boys, and the nuns for young ladies. My lords, I, for my part, am well pleased that the

* Meaning, apparently, the Trappists and Carthusians.

Roman Catholics of this country are at last furnished with the means of education for their sons and daughters within the kingdom. It was a cruel and a weak policy to compel the Roman Catholics to send their children abroad for that liberal education which they could not receive at home; and I believe your lordships will agree with me that a Roman Catholic education at home is a much better thing than a Roman Catholic education in a foreign country. For this reason I rejoice at the institution of respectable Roman Catholic schools in different parts of the kingdom." He then showed that by the act of 1791 no person professing the Roman Catholic religion who should receive into his school the child of any Protestant father could have any benefit from that act; it was especially so provided by the 13th, 14th, 15th, and 16th clauses; consequently a person so offending was subject to the penalties of all the subsisting statutes against popish schoolmasters; to the forfeiture of 10*l.* a-month and one year's imprisonment, besides being disabled from ever again acting as a teacher, by the 23 Eliz. c. 1, § 6; and to a fine of forty shillings for every day he might have kept school, by the 1 Jac. c. 4, which latter statute further encouraged informations by providing that half the penalty should go to the king and half to the person suing. Then, as for the other danger apprehended by the framers of the bill, namely, that, in consequence of the settlements of these monks and nuns from France, monastic institutions might gain a permanent establishment in this country, "My lords," said Horsley, addressing himself to the case of the nuns, of whom alone the numbers could inspire any alarm, "if any ten, or twenty, or a larger number of these ladies should choose to take a great house, where they may live together as they have been used to do all their lives, and lead their lives according to their old habits,—getting up in the morning and retiring at night at stated hours, dining upon fish on some days of the week, upon eggs on others,—I protest I can discover no crime, no harm, no danger in all this; and I cannot imagine why we should

be anxious to prevent it." But it was feared they might inveigle English women to join them, and so monastic institutions might be permanently re-established in the country. To show the groundlessness of this apprehension Horsley quoted the 17th section of the act of 1791, which provided that nothing contained in that act should make it lawful to found, endow, or establish any monastic society in this country, and that all uses, trusts, and dispositions, whether of real or personal property, which might have been deemed superstitious or unlawful previously to the passing of the act, should continue to be so deemed and taken. Now, by the 1 Geo. I. sess. 2, c. 50, property of any kind, or granted in any way, devised, bequeathed, or settled upon trust, so that the profits might be applied to any abbey, priory, convent, nunnery, college of Jesuits, or seminary or school of popish education, was forfeited to the king for the use of the public. Having cleared his breast, the right reverend prelate sat down, after formally moving that the bill should be committed for that day three months. His speech probably determined the fate of the measure. The Bishop of Winchester (Brownlow North, a younger brother of Lord North) ventured a few feeble words in its support; and Lord Loughborough, the chancellor, also expressed his opinion that it contained some good provisions, and might be amended so as to be highly useful; but another minister, Lord Grenville, the foreign secretary, agreed with Horsley in denouncing it as both unnecessary and mischievous; and the motion for committing it that day three months—in other words, for throwing it out—was agreed to, apparently without a division.

The first question connected with religion or the church that came before the legislature after the union with Ireland, was that of the eligibility of persons in holy orders to sit in the House of Commons. This question arose in consequence of the return of the celebrated John Horne Tooke, long distinguished as a reformer of the first water both in politics and in philology, as one of the representatives for the rotten borough of Old Sarum, on

the nomination of the aristocratic and autocratic patron Lord Camelford, to the first imperial parliament, which met on the 2nd of February, 1801. Tooke, introduced by his friend Sir Francis Burdett and another member, took the oaths and his seat on the 16th of February; when Earl Temple immediately rose and gave notice that, if no petition should be presented against the honourable gentleman's return within the allotted fourteen days, he should then submit a motion on the subject. Nothing farther, however, was done in the matter till the 10th of March. Tooke, according to his own account, had attended in his place at the expiration of fourteen, fifteen, sixteen days, without receiving any communication from Temple. This he stated in a speech which he made when the case came on. "On the seventeenth," he continued, "severe indisposition kept me away: I found on the eighteenth that his lordship, in my absence, had given notice that he should on this day (the 10th of March) make a motion respecting the eligibility of the Rev. John Horne Tooke to a seat in this House. I attended on that day: his lordship then came to me, and very handsomely said he would tell me what sort of a motion it would be. The lawyers, his lordship said, had not been able to determine what sort of a motion he should make on the subject; but he told me he should be able to tell me what would be the motion on Tuesday. I attended; and then his lordship, instead of informing me of anything, made a new motion for the examination of witnesses." Meanwhile, Tooke had, with his characteristic dexterity, been manifestly steering his course in the House with a view to conciliate the quarter from which he had most to fear. In a debate, for instance, on the 19th of February, on a motion for censuring one of the late continental expeditions, the renowned champion of reform and democracy, who had already consented to enter the House of Commons as the nominee of a peer, and to sit as a representative without a constituency, surprised the public by making his *debut* as a parliamentary orator with a speech in defence of ministers. In another debate on the 2nd of March, again he took occasion to

proclaim the first principle of his political creed to be an attachment to the ancient institutions of the country. "I am supposed," he said, "to be a great friend to innovations of every kind. I have been represented as an innovator, but I do not deserve that title. . . . I look to what is established, and approve of it—not because it is the best, but because it is established. Let any man examine what have been the sentiments that, upon every occasion, have fallen from me, and he will find that I have uniformly been against innovation." Temple's motion on the 10th of March was merely to call witnesses to the bar to prove the fact of the member for Old Sarum having taken holy orders; it was carried, after some debate, by a majority of 150 to 66; the witnesses were examined, and proved what was wanted; a select committee was then appointed to search the journals of the House, and the records of parliament, for precedents. This committee did not give in its report till the 2nd of April: and the matter was not again taken up till the 4th of May. Long before this, fortunately for Tooke, if he himself had not come to be regarded as a ministerialist, Lord Temple, formerly a steady adherent of Pitt, had, on the accession of the Addington ministry, passed over to the opposition. On the 12th of March we find the member for Old Sarum coming forward at the close of an animated debate on a motion by Sheridan for resisting the continuance of the Irish Martial-Law Bill, with a proposal to mediate between the two contending parties, or, as he phrased it, to reconcile both sides of the House, and admitting that, although martial law might not be necessary for Ireland, martial force undoubtedly was. On the 25th of the same month, on the other hand, after the change of ministry, when Mr. Grey moved for a committee on the state of the nation, Temple joined the opposition, and both voted and spoke in favour of Grey's motion. All this, no doubt, told upon the final decision of the House as to Tooke's case, notwithstanding that he still continued to profess himself a patriot, and had, indeed, not only voted for Grey's committee as well as Temple, but had afterwards, on the

14th of April, made a speech against the Habeas Corpus Suspension Bill—an occasion on which the minister could scarcely have expected him to sit silent unless he had actually sold himself for a sum of money, and then he would not have been worth purchasing. At the same time, in his speech on the 10th of March, on Temple's motion for calling witnesses to the bar to prove the fact of his ordination, he took care to hold himself out to the public as a martyr to his principles, to the democratic or ultra-liberal politics of which he had been so noted a professor. "I believe," he said, "this motion springs not from personal enmity to me (for I do not believe there is any personal enmity to me upon earth), but from political animosity." The motion also was resisted by Fox, Sheridan, Erskine, and the opposition or Whig party generally. The evidence taken at the bar proved that Tooke, then Mr. John Horne Tooke, B.A., of St. John's College, Cambridge, had been ordained a priest so long ago as on the 23rd of November, 1760, and that he had officiated as such for some time at the chapel of New Brentford, administering the Sacraments, performing all the other duties, and receiving his "small tithes and other things by way of composition as ecclesiastical dues." In fact, Tooke, who had now entered Parliament at the mature age of sixty-five, had been for about thirteen years minister at New Brentford, although, indeed, he had twice during that time managed to get away to the continent with pupils, in the capacity of a travelling tutor, and nearly all the while he remained at home had been much more of a political agitator than a parson. It appeared, from the cases stated in the report of the committee, that the practice throughout the seventeenth century had been to consider persons who had taken holy orders as disqualified to sit in the House; and their first report did not quote any case of later date than 1661. But in a second report they gave the entries from the journals respecting the case of a Mr. Edward Rushworth, a clerk, returned in 1784, as one of the members for the borough of Newport, in the Isle of Wight, who was petitioned against, but eventually

allowed to retain his seat. On the 4th of May, after the order of the day had been read for taking the report of the committee into consideration, Earl Temple moved that "a new writ should be issued for the election of a burgess to serve for the borough of Old Sarum, in room of the Reverend John Horne Tooke, who, being at the time of his election in priest's orders, was, and is, incapable of sitting in this House." The opposition to Temple's motion was led by Mr. Addington, the prime minister. His argument was somewhat perplexed; but the main drift of what he said seemed to be that, by the principle of Mr. Grenville's bill, every case of a disputed election ought to be left to the decision of a committee, and that the House should never interfere in any such case except when circumstances made it absolutely necessary. He admitted the abstract principle that persons in holy orders were ineligible; but he was convinced there was no real distinction between the state of a deacon and that of a priest; and, as a committee had decided that a deacon was eligible, another committee might possibly find Mr. Tooke's return good, if he should be again elected for Old Sarum, which he might very possibly be in the face of such a resolution as it was now proposed to pass. On the whole, while he would not have objected to the resolution if it had only stated a principle, he could not agree to that part of it which decided upon the special case; and therefore, to put the House in the way of getting at the ulterior object, and to meet, as he conceived, the general wish of the House, he concluded by moving the previous question. Tooke himself then rose—as he professed, with the greatest reluctance. He began by giving them a sketch of the history of his life. He had been engaged, he said, in many important struggles, but scarcely ever had he been individually concerned. If, instead of being a clergyman, he had been a notorious infidel, he would have been, he said, as competent to sit as any member present. He did not proceed to consider the case of a person who might be *both* an ordained clergyman and an avowed infidel. With regard to precedents, he affirmed that all persons who had in

former times been declared ineligible would be found to have actually continued to sit till they were disqualified by Act of Parliament. He meant that no particular description of persons had ever before been absolutely disqualified otherwise than by statute. Minors, aliens, and others, for instance, notwithstanding many resolutions of the House in special instances, had repeatedly been allowed to sit, till an Act was passed disqualifying them in the reign of King William. But he did not venture to deny that individuals of these classes had uniformly, or at least generally, been found incapable of sitting, and turned out—as it was now proposed he himself should be—whenever the question was raised. In the course of the debate that followed, Temple's motion was warmly opposed by Fox, who boldly maintained that clergymen neither were, nor ought to be, disqualified from sitting, and ended his speech by declaring that he did not see a scintilla either of reason or of law to support the present proceeding. The same line of argument was taken by Erskine and Grey: Sir William Scott and Mr. Charles Williams Wynn supported the original motion; the attorney-general, (Sir Edward Law, afterwards Lord Ellenborough) and the solicitor-general (the Hon. Spencer Perceval) spoke in favour of that made by Addington, which, on a division, was carried by a majority of 94 to 53. So the reverend member for Old Sarum retained possession of his seat. Addington, however, now proceeded to take measures to prevent his ever being returned a second time. Two days after this vote, the chancellor of the exchequer moved for, and obtained, leave to bring in a Bill, entitled, "A Bill to prevent Doubts respecting the Eligibility of Persons in Holy Orders to sit in the House of Commons," which, in fact, as eventually passed into a law,* disqualified not only priests and deacons of the church of England, but also all ministers and licensed preachers of the church of Scotland.

In the same session in which this question was settled

* The Stat. 41 Geo. III. c. 68.

commenced the legislative agitation of sundry other questions relating to the rights, duties, and stations of the clergy, which were far from being so speedily or so easily determined. The attention of Parliament appears to have been, in the first instance, called to the subject by a number of prosecutions which had been lately raised against clergymen under an Act of the 21st of Henry VIII., entitled, "Spiritual Persons abridged from having Pluralities of Livings, and from taking of Farms, &c." The strict observance of the regulations of this old statute had, in the change of times and circumstances, long been neglected and fallen into oblivion, when it was thus anew called into action by certain common informers for purposes of extortion.

In the various discussions which took place in parliament during the present period respecting these and some other propositions as to ecclesiastical matters, many facts were mentioned relating to the state of the established church and the clergy, some of the most important of which it may be desirable to notice here.

In 1804 the provision made for the clergy in the city of London came under discussion in the course of the debates on a bill for increasing the amount of certain of the livings there, the parochial assessments for which, it appeared, still remained the same as settled by what is called the Fire Act, passed after the great fire of 1666. In a debate on the motion for the third reading of this bill in the Lords, on the 19th of July, the Bishop of London (Porteous) stated that, of 50 livings in the city, the value of the highest was only 200*l.* per annum; others were only 150*l.*; many were no more than 100*l.* In another debate, on the 23rd, Bishop Horsley (then of St. Asaph) explained that the bill affected 86 parishes; but, owing to the unions that had been made after the great fire, only 51 (a mistake, we believe, for 50) livings; and that there were, besides, 19 London parishes which it did not comprehend. In these last, he stated, the average annual amount of the assessments raised for the support of the clergyman was 290*l.* The bill met with some opposition; but it eventually passed. It

raised the value of the lowest of the 50 livings to 200*l.*, and that of the highest to 366*l.*

In 1805 a bill was brought in to repeal so much of an act of the 9th of George II. as went to restrain colleges in the universities of Oxford and Cambridge from purchasing the advowsons of livings. The law proposed to be abrogated by this bill was stated to have been enacted at the instance of Lord Hardwicke, and considerable opposition was made to its repeal. It was contended, however, that under existing circumstances the restraint was attended with injurious effects. The number of livings in the gift of the universities, it was stated by the bishop of Oxford (Randolph), did not exceed a moiety of the number of the members, meaning probably the members who were in holy orders or destined for the church. Afterwards in another debate, on the 29th of April, the right reverend prelate entered into some calculations, from which it appeared that the entire number of livings at the disposal of the colleges and universities, among which were many of small value, did not amount to 700. If this account was correct, the bill, which soon after passed into a law, has not had a very extensive operation in the space of nearly 40 years that has since elapsed; for the number of advowsons possessed by the universities and colleges at the present moment does not amount to quite 750. Of these the two universities hold about 600.

In 1809 a grant of 100,000*l.* was made to the governors of Queen Anne's bounty, the better to enable them to fulfil the objects of their trust. In proposing this grant, Mr. Perceval stated that it would take forty years for the first-fruits and tenths alone, which Queen Anne had made over for that purpose, to raise all the poor livings even to the moderate value of 50*l.* a-year. According to the Report of the Commissioners of Ecclesiastical Revenues, published in June, 1835, there were at that date still 297 benefices under that value. The grant was opposed in the Upper House by Lord Holland; in reply to whom the Earl of Harrowby, *the 18th of June, 1810*, went at great length into

financial circumstances of the church. At this time the intention of the government appears to have been that the grant of 100,000*l.* should be continued annually until all the livings in the church should be raised to 150*l.*, or at least 100*l.*, a-year. Lord Harrowby stated, that when Queen Anne's fund was first established the number of livings under 50*l.* was between 5000 and 6000; and that now there were not much more than 1000 under that value, and not above 4000 under 150*l.* per annum. It had been generally supposed that the poor livings were chiefly confined to parishes in which the population was inconsiderable and the duty light—"remote villages, where we wished certainly to give the clergyman a better income, because it was not fitting that he should receive less than a day-labourer, but where his poverty was out of sight, and did not affect the interests of any considerable portion of the community." Returns which had been recently obtained, however, proved the error of this supposition. It appeared that, of the whole number of livings under 150*l.* per annum, there were above 600 which, in 1801, had a population of between 500 and 1000 persons, and nearly 500 having a population of above 1000; of these 79 had between 2000 and 3000; 35 between 3000 and 4000; 17 between 4000 and 5000; 10 between 5000 and 6000; and some much more. In 15 parishes in the diocese of Chester, containing in all a population of 208,000 persons, the entire revenue of the clergy was no more than 1315*l.* His lordship next proceeded to the subject of the residence of the clergy. According to returns made by the bishops in 1807, the number of incumbents legally resident in the 11,164 parishes of England and Wales was only 4412, or little more than one in every third parish. The number actually resident, even including some who lived not within but only in the neighbourhood of their parishes, certainly did not exceed 5000, or did not reach to nearly one in every two parishes. There were, indeed, 340 other persons returned as exempt on account of cathedral or college offices, many of whom might probably be resident par-

of the year ; but even the addition of all these would still leave considerably more than half the parishes of the kingdom entirely in the charge of curates. In 1835, we may observe, it was found that the total number of parishes in England and Wales was 11,077 ; the total number of benefices, 10,517 ; and the whole number of curates, 5227. So that still, as formerly, we may say that curates are the actual pastors of about half the parishes in the kingdom. Of the resident incumbents in 1810, there were about 1500 whose incomes were under 150*l.* per annum. These were all the incumbents that were resident, out of about 4000 parishes, in which, as stated above, the livings were of that amount. Of these poorly endowed livings, therefore, 2500, or five-eighths of the whole, were left to the pastoral superintendence of curates. In the remaining 7167 parishes, again, where the value of the living exceeded 150*l.*, there were 3556 incumbents either actually or virtually resident, leaving only 2612 cases, or little more than a third of the entire number, in which curates were left to do the duties. The whole number of non-resident incumbents of all classes, after deducting dilapidated churches and sinecures, was found to be 5925. Of these, those who were non-resident upon one benefice on account of residence upon another were 1797 ; those who resided in a house of their own or of a relative were 152 ; those who resided near their parishes and did duty were 476. Deducting these three classes from the whole number, there still remained 3500 parishes which must either have no curate at all—a thing which Lord Harrowby said he trusted the vigilance of the church never permitted—or they must be served by the incumbent or curate of a neighbouring parish, which was next to not being served at all ; or they must be served by a curate paid out of what the incumbent could spare from the income of the benefice. It appeared that the greatest number of pluralities was not among the poorest classes of incumbents. This, indeed, was only what was to have been expected ; for, as his lordship remarked, “ the incumbent of a large living was much more likely,

O 2

from his situation and connexions, to procure a second, than the incumbent of a small one." The act regulating the salaries of curates had not yet passed, and Lord Harrowby took an opportunity in this speech of expressing himself in terms of strong condemnation on the rate at which the services of such assistants were sometimes remunerated by the actual incumbent. "The present practice," he said, "according to which the non-resident incumbents of livings of 50*l.*, 60*l.* or 70*l.* a-year put into their own pockets a portion of this wretched pittance, and left much less than the wages of a day-labourer for the subsistence of their curates, appeared to him far from creditable to the parties concerned, and calculated to degrade the character of the church. Many instances came within his own knowledge in which parishes were served for 20*l.*, or even for 10*l.* per annum; and in which, of course, all they knew of their clergyman was the sound of his voice in the reading desk or pulpit once a-week, a fortnight, or a month." In 1835 it was found that the average salary of curates exceeded 80*l.*

A series of discussions on the subject of tithes was commenced in 1806, by a motion for certain returns which was made in the House of Commons on the 16th of May, by Mr. J. Christian Curwen.

The Catholics anticipated great advantages from the accession of the Whigs to office on the death of Mr. Pitt.

Fox, when he was himself premier, pursued the very same course as his predecessor.

Fox died in September, 1806, leaving Lord Grenville at the head of affairs; and then, on the 5th of March, 1807, the first day of the next session, with a new parliament, Lord Howick, secretary for foreign affairs, moved for and obtained leave in the Commons to bring in, not a measure for giving the Catholics seats in parliament, but only a bill for enabling them to hold the higher commissions in the army and navy. The fate of this proposition, involving, as it did, that of the ministry which brought it forward, forms a memorable part of the general history of the country. On the 18th of March the

second reading of the bill, which had been already twice postponed, was, on the motion of Lord Howick, postponed a third time, under circumstances stated not at that moment to admit of explanation. In point of fact, the ministers, finding that the king would not give his consent to the bill, agreed to withdraw it; but his majesty, not satisfied with this, required them to sign an engagement that they would propose no further concessions to the Roman Catholics; and the day after their refusal to comply with that demand he sent them an intimation that he must look out for other servants.

After this Catholic emancipation became almost an annual question in parliament.

During the excitement of the long war against Bonaparte little was really done in furtherance of toleration. But the penal laws which remained unrepealed were left dormant; and, with the exception of one or two insignificant sects, the mass of the dissenters, as well as the Roman Catholics, were steady in their loyalty. The great changes which have taken place since the peace—the passing of the Catholic Emancipation bill, &c.—have been narrated in the two last volumes of this work, and require no further comment.

Into the recent dissensions in the Kirk of Scotland, and the progress and wonderful activity of the free-church party in that country, our limits forbid us to enter; nor can we discuss the merits and demerits of the Oxford Tractarians and Puseyites.

We can only hope that good may come out of the religious agitation on either side of the Tweed, and that the worship of the Anglican church may be beautified and spiritualized without relapsing into superstition.



NOTE.—Throughout this work the Chapters on RELIGION have been abridged from the Chapters on that subject in the ‘Pictorial History of England,’ which were, for the greater part, written by Mr. Craik.

THE END.



